

# The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES.

VOL. XXIII, No. 6.

JUNE 1943

CARDINAL HINSLEY

I HAVE been asked to write a personal appreciation of the late Cardinal Hinsley; personal, that is, a picture not of his work as Archbishop but of his relations with others, of his home life and daily habits, and above all of his sanctity. I am so conscious of the enormous privilege that was mine in having been intimately associated for nearly eight years with such a man that I know that it is my duty to try to share that experience with my fellow priests. But the subject is tremendous; it would require—what I am not—an artist to do it justice.

First I must tell the story of his nomination to the See of Westminster, a story that I heard in part from himself and in part from others who were with him in Rome at the time. To an essentially active and large-minded man life in the Canonica of St. Peter's was deadly. With little or no outlet for his abilities and energy of character he had begun to fret and even to decline. It was therefore with no little pleasure that one day early in March of 1935 Archbishop Hinsley, a Canon of St. Peter's, obeyed the summons of Cardinal Rossi, the head of the Consistory, to go and see him. The Archbishop hoped and expected that he was to be given something to do in one of the Councils or Congregations. Some hours later he returned to his apartments looking haggard and with dragging feet. The task which he had in fact been given seemed a crushing one at the age of nearly seventy. Later the story of that interview with Cardinal Rossi came out. His Eminence, after the usual small talk with which all Italians must begin, asked a question: "Eccellenza, His Holiness wants to know your opinion as to who should be appointed to succeed the late Cardinal Bourne as Archbishop of Westminster." The Archbishop replied that since he himself had been out of England for more than eighteen years he could hardly be expected to know the possible candidates or to be able to advise on so important a matter. But the Cardinal pressed him, saying that during his time as Rector of the Venerable English College he must surely have met and known many of the English ecclesiastics and prelates; perhaps he could name several, half a dozen maybe, without discriminating between them, any of whom he would think as suitable for the post? After some consideration Mgr. Hinsley again protested: "I have never belonged to Westminster. I don't know the men there. Your Eminence must tell His Holiness that I cannot possibly give an opinion on so grave a question. . . ." And then finally, after a pause, the Cardinal spoke bluntly: "The Holy Father says you are the man." I can well imagine the Archbishop's first reactions to the shock of those words; the whispered prayer, which I was later to hear so very often, escaping his lips: "O

God, have mercy on me"; the arms thrown out across the table and the head sinking. And then Cardinal Rossi, to console him, told him that he could write out his reasons for his unwillingness to accept: "I am to see His Holiness on Wednesday morning; write me a letter and bring it to me on Tuesday evening and I will promise to take it to the Holy Father." And so back to the Canonica, the days following occupied with feverish writing and rewriting of the letter in which he stated his reasons for declining, broken only by long spells of agonizing prayer. On Tuesday evening the final version of the letter was taken by him to Cardinal Rossi, whose only comment, made smilingly after reading it through, was: "Sono soltanto i ragazzini che dicono bugie così"—"It's only small boys who tell lies like these." But His Eminence promised to take it to the Holy Father and to call himself at the Archbishop's apartments immediately after his audience. The next morning he came, and after the usual maddening small talk, the admiring of the view from the windows and so on, came the report of the Pope's answer: "The Holy Father asks for your obedience. Is it obedience?"

Some people think that Pius XI had put the retired missionary and Delegate Apostolic into the Canonica with the intention later of asking him to succeed Cardinal Bourne, already a very sick man. Others felt that the idea of making him Archbishop of Westminster came to the Pope when Archbishop Hinsley, already a Canon of St. Peter's, made a speech in his presence at the final Consistory before the canonization of St. John Fisher and St. Thomas More. This speech was a striking one in faultless Italian but delivered in that forceful Yorkshire way that always commanded interest and attention. The Holy Father and the many Cardinals present were noticeably impressed. But Pius XI himself told Archbishop Hinsley, at the time when he personally invested him with the Pallium, that the name of Hinsley had first come to him when he was saying a Votive Mass of the Holy Ghost for guidance in the choice of Cardinal Bourne's successor. Immediately after that Mass the Holy Father had sent for Cardinal Rossi.

I do not propose to enumerate all the gigantic tasks that the new Archbishop of Westminster found awaiting him when he came to England. Others can do and have done that better than I. Many stories could be told of those early years at Westminster and how he won the esteem and affection of his priests; how some went in to see him burning with indignation over some question or other, and came out half an hour or so later utterly changed. On such occasions many said to me: "That man rules by love and sympathy; I would do anything he wished." Striking also was the way in which, all unknown perhaps to himself, he won the love of many thousands of his people by going round to church after church during the great diocesan Mission Weeks that he had ordered; walking up the aisle of each crowded church quite simply and unannounced, stopping the preacher for a moment or two, saying just a few words himself from the sanctuary steps, giving his blessing, and then, with a word of thanks to the preacher,

passing out again and on to the next church. Those first years at Westminster were consecrated almost entirely to his diocese; only on the rarest occasion could he be induced to journey anywhere outside its bounds and even then he was all impatience to be back. There was always, especially during those early years, a certain impetuosity, a holy impatience underlying the outward calm that was certainly the work of grace and the result of prayer. He was over seventy and there was so much to do, so little time left in which to do it.

But over his prayers themselves there was never any hurry. His morning meditation before his Mass lasted very rarely less than half an hour, often enough it lasted nearly twice that time. Generally he used for it either a New Testament or one or other of Bishop Hedley's books. Certainly he believed himself in the advice that he had so often given with passionate sincerity to the students under him during his time as Rector of the English College: "Never give up your morning meditation. A priest who gives up his meditation soon goes dry." Over his Mass he would take a full half-hour, and later on, when his left eye was quite blind, it took him usually 35 to 40 minutes to say Mass. He never dawdled over the actions but the words were said with great exactness. When his eyes began to fail him, reading the Missal became more difficult and he took longer. During his prayers and often even during his Mass (though I am sure that he was unconscious of it) an ejaculation would slip out, sometimes in Latin: "Domine salva nos", more often in English: "O God, have mercy . . ." with the slight Yorkshire accentuation of the "r" in the last word. At his Mass this usually happened when he was on his way to the Epistle side for the washing of the hands and before he began the "Lavabo". Sometimes I felt like telling him that it was a bad habit that he was getting into. But I never did: that prayer was so much a part of him, and I am quite sure he had no idea that its utterance was audible to others: "O God, have mercy on me." Over his breviary he was scrupulously exact and, I always used to think, very slow. If ever circumstances prevented him from saying all the Little Hours before luncheon he was quite unhappy over it. Matins and Lauds were invariably anticipated during the late afternoon or early evening.

And yet with all that time spent in prayer, more usually in the chapel before the Blessed Sacrament, and often enough with an additional "visit" as well sometime or other during the day, the amount of work which he accomplished at other times was quite astounding. Articles, broadcasts, speeches, pastorals—all were prepared with much labour and prayer, and all written out by him with his own hand. He never dictated letters in the ordinary way. Over the less important ones he would give me some idea of what he wanted said in reply and I would myself scribble a note of it in the margin. Sometimes he would write a line or two of guidance at the top. But all the important letters he wrote out himself in full, whether on scrap paper to be typed out by me or my colleague so that a copy could

be taken and filed, whether they were to be signed by himself as Archbishop or by a Secretary. Many letters were written in his own hand. He was a fast worker. I often wondered how he did it all and yet managed to find so much time for prayer and reading. He went to Confession at least every fortnight, usually choosing as his confessor some experienced priest of an age with himself. During his last years at Hare Street, however, I myself had the edifying but humbling rôle of confessor; for it was indeed most humbling to have a Prince of the Church who was at the same time so simple and such a saint kneeling down at one's feet, after removing his zucchetto, and confessing his faults and asking one's help and advice just as though he were a small boy. And yet what a privilege; what a grace!

What were the greatest qualities of Arthur Cardinal Hinsley? He could not really be called brilliant, though he was indeed eminently wise and profoundly knowledgeable. His memory was often astounding both of people whom he had met and of studies that he had made many years before. He was a good theologian. It was always immensely interesting to watch and listen when he and some other really intelligent man were talking together, whatever the subject of conversation might be. One could not help seeing the effect of the Cardinal's personality on the other person, the charm that seemed to influence for good whoever it was that spoke with him. But often too I was amazed by the depth of knowledge that on such occasions he showed, knowledge of what seemed to me the most obscure subjects that might happen to crop up in the conversation. He read widely and he remembered what he read. As an administrator he certainly showed great qualities. He was never a man who wanted things done only in his own particular way. He would choose some priest or some layman for a particular responsibility, he would fire him with something of his own zeal for the task he had put upon him, but then he would always let that person do the job in his own way, giving him support and encouragement whenever necessary or when it was sought.

But I think his real greatness lay essentially in his own deep humility; the tact, the human touch—call it what you will—came from his own deep humbleness of heart. He was always far more ready to see in others the good rather than the less good. In himself he always saw much that he felt was amiss. "O God, have mercy on me" was his constant prayer. His courtesy to others came also from his own humility. He scarcely ever took a cigarette, for instance—and he smoked quite often—without saying "May I, do you think?" or "Do you mind if I have another cigarette?" to whoever else happened to be in the room. Perhaps the finest example of his humility was on an occasion during the Abyssinian troubles. In a sermon in defence of the Holy Father who was being widely attacked in this country, a sermon which he had prepared in his most impetuous mood, he had used a wrong word. He had called the Pope a "helpless old man". Patently he meant "defenceless", but the other word was in fact used. Immediately that

express  
heavy  
led the  
Archbi  
sadden  
concer  
but wh  
at the  
remain  
of othe  
short l  
soever  
critics  
sought  
Ho  
spoke  
throm  
hundr  
when  
letters  
In this  
ever h  
revere  
readin  
his eye  
make  
or hea  
world  
not th  
feelin  
during  
accom  
been s  
Cardin  
of his  
since  
home-  
whose  
"He v  
Ar  
especi  
declin  
and y  
Catho  
more



expression "helpless old man" was taken from its context and billed in heavy type in most of the secular press, especially in those papers that had led the attack on His Holiness. Violent and scathing letters poured in to Archbishop's House or appeared in newspapers. The Archbishop was saddened, but remained throughout completely calm. His one and only concern was obviously not what people thought or wrote or said of him, but whether he had harmed the Pope. Whilst others boiled with indignation at the unfairness and injustice of the attack, he, the object of that attack, remained absolutely unperturbed. In his own hand he wrote, on the advice of others, a letter in Italian to the Cardinal Secretary of State. It was a very short letter and stated briefly the simple facts without any attempt whatsoever to excuse himself or to put the blame elsewhere. He replied to his critics in a short and dignified letter to *The Times* in the writing of which he sought the help of another. And that was all.

How afraid he was of pride may be shown by some words which he spoke only a few days before his death. Three days after the cardiac thrombosis he seemed well enough to have read to him just a few of the hundreds of telegrams and letters that had poured into Hare Street House when the news of his serious illness became known. I had read two or three letters only, and then came to one which I had thought particularly charming. In this there was a sentence which began: "I do not think that there can ever have been an Archbishop of Westminster so much loved and so revered. . . ." As I read that I heard the Cardinal choke. I stopped reading and was distressed to see a look of real pain, almost of agony, in his eyes. And then he spoke: "Stop, Father! I won't hear any more. Don't make me proud." I wonder what he would have felt had he lived to read or hear about all the tributes since paid to him: tributes from all over the world; appreciations that astounded those who knew him most intimately; not that they seemed in any way to exaggerate or to go beyond our own feelings and opinions of him, but solely because we had no idea that he who during his last years had been prevented by suffering and ill-health from accomplishing as much as he would have wished should nevertheless have been so widely known and so universally loved: "The greatest English Cardinal since Wolsey"; "one of the greatest if not the greatest Englishmen of his day"; "who did more for the Church in this country than anyone since Cardinal St. John Fisher". Indeed a prophet is not known in his home-circle, and my own feelings were far better expressed by an M.P. whose acquaintance with him was comparatively slight, but who wrote: "He was the most lovable man I have ever met."

And now I must say something of his sufferings and his illness, and especially of those last days of his life. Looking back, one can see that his decline in health began with the fall of France, which he felt most acutely; and yet it is really from about that time that he became known outside Catholic circles as a Leader of his country's cause. Angina, aggravated more and more by arterio-sclerosis, caused periods of acute suffering,

attacks which slowly increased in frequency and in duration. He was always so brave and so patient that I am quite sure now that we none of us knew how much suffering he had to bear. But the effects of it became more and more obvious. He began by losing weight very considerably. Then these attacks began to come on also during the night so that he lost sleep and dreaded going up to bed. Often during the last year he spent the greater part of the night in an arm-chair. His Auxiliary Bishops and his two Vicars General took all the diocesan burdens they possibly could off his shoulders. Yet a great weariness seemed to bear him down. But he remained always so patient, so resigned, so brave, that we who were with him became almost accustomed to his suffering. "How did you sleep last night, Eminence?" "Not very well; but I rested." "Did you have any pains?" "Yes, I had to get up once or twice," and then, with his gentle smile, "*Povera natura umana!*" Then finally came the morning of St. David's Day, 1 March, and with it the great agony, a coronary thrombosis. It began somewhere round about midnight. His niece, always his most practical and devoted attendant when he was suffering, awoke me about 1.30 a.m. and I found him standing grey in the face yet almost smiling through the pain. She had already given him all the usual remedies for heart-attacks, yet without his obtaining much relief. An occasional prayer groaned out and then often: "It's getting better"; "It's passing off now." "You go back to bed, Father." I had to go out of his room for a short time once, he was so insistent. About 2.30 or soon after I telephoned to the doctor, who came quite quickly, though to us it seemed an age. He wanted to give him morphia, but by then the attack had passed off and the Cardinal, exhausted and lying back in an arm-chair, asked to be left alone: "I'm quite easy now, Doctor; please don't disturb me." And so after a while the doctor left, promising to return at 7.0. Alas, soon after the pain began anew, and lasted almost continually till nearly 6.0 a.m. I had the Holy Oils in my dressing-gown pocket. But the Cardinal's bravery and his so often repeated "It's getting easier now", "It's better", deceived us. Late that afternoon I learned from the heart specialist who came down from London that the "attack" on this night had been a thrombosis; "the greatest pain that is known in the whole of medical science", he told me. Morphia could not have prevented it but it would have stopped the agony. Perhaps God in His Providence wanted His servant to bear for a while the full weight of the Cross.

During all the seventeen days that followed before the final syncope, which all the doctors warned us was a likely possibility at any moment of the day or night, the Cardinal had some discomfort at times but little pain. When told how all the children of England were praying for him he answered, "That's right, it's the prayers of the children which are going to get me into heaven." Had he any premonition of approaching death? I do not think so. At another time he said, "Well, this is the best day I've had: I think the worst is over." And yet during all those days—and on

some o  
in anyt  
and row  
saying  
many t  
his life  
On  
been pa  
go up  
Dollis  
Cardin  
he add  
I'm rea  
one mo  
most o  
evenin  
stitutee  
as we  
often e  
in the  
very re  
that ni  
endless  
then b  
giving  
nearer,  
liveth  
Priest.

ON  
in  
answer  
earlier  
listenin  
now b  
—Mr.  
Chance  
in the  
the six

some of them he was feeling comparatively well—he showed little interest in anything to do with this world. Always he prayed; his rosary went round and round. Ever since the beginning of the war he had made a habit of saying all fifteen mysteries each evening, but now he must have said them all many times every day. God knows he was weary enough of the burden of his life and ready enough to die; but he wanted only God's will.

On the afternoon of the last day of his life, a day during which he had been particularly well, one of his Blue Nun nurses—both were Irish—was to go up to London to fetch some things from her convent, the Hospital at Dollis Hill. It was already the time for the First Vespers of St. Patrick. The Cardinal told her to take his special blessing to all the other Sisters, and then he added: "And tell Paddy that if there's some more work for me to do, I'm ready." That same Sister, who was the Cardinal's night nurse, confessed one morning earlier in that week that she had been in floods of tears during most of the night. The doctor had varied the dose of morphia every evening according to the patient's condition at the time. Sometimes he substituted another drug, usually heroin. That night he tried hyoscine, which, as we were warned beforehand, reacts differently on different people and often enough makes the patient delirious. It did not prove to be a success in the Cardinal's case, and although the delirium soon passed off he had a very restless night. Next morning the night nurse told us that all through that night the Cardinal had been "saying Mass", not speaking at all but endlessly going through all the actions; at one moment with hands extended, then blessing the "offerings", raising the "host" and then the "chalice", giving "Holy Communion" and beckoning the communicants to come nearer, giving the final blessing—and so for hours on end. "As a man liveth so shall he die", and Cardinal Hinsley was above all things else a Priest.

VALENTINE ELWES.

---

---

## THE ANVIL

ON 6 May the B.B.C. began a second series of broadcasts of the Anvil, in which a little group of members of different Christian bodies answer questions sent in by listeners. The new series differs from the earlier in one or two particulars. The broadcasts are at a much better listening time—8 o'clock instead of 10.10. The weekly team of four will now be chosen from a group of about a dozen. There is a new chairman—Mr. Quintin Hogg, M.P., a young barrister and the son of an ex-Lord Chancellor, lately returned after three years' service with the Eighth Army in the Middle East. And the new series will have a much longer run than the six weeks of the earlier one. All this would seem to show that the

B.B.C. consider their venture to have been a success, a conclusion that can be supported by some very remarkable facts.

The idea originated at a meeting held last spring attended by a number of people of some standing in their own religious body, who were invited to criticize the past achievements of the Religious Department of the B.B.C. and to suggest developments and improvements. One of the chief suggestions made was the introduction of some sort of Religious Brains Trust. The idea was seized on by the Department, but there were many doubts and difficulties to be overcome. Important officials at Broadcasting House had to be convinced that here was the material for good interesting programmes which would not antagonize large sections of the community or merely provoke harmful and disturbing religious controversy. The fears of religious leaders had to be allayed. An Anglican said that he thought the Roman Catholics would come out of it best because their man would always be clear and to the point, even if he was talking nonsense! Some of the Free Churchmen welcomed the idea enthusiastically, but others were suspicious from the beginning. The chief objection raised by Catholics was that by taking part with others in a discussion of this kind, seemingly on terms of complete equality, we were compromising our position as members of the One True Church of Christ. It is interesting to notice in passing that this circumstance which constituted the chief obstacle to our participation was at other times used to show that the Anvil offered new and unheard-of opportunities of reaching with Catholic truth millions of non-religious and vaguely-religious people who would otherwise be completely cut off from any Christian influence; and hence, that the Anvil should be supported with energy and enthusiasm as a wonderful new form of the apostolate with boundless possibilities, giving the first real chance of direct contact with the masses of the people.

Discussions and preliminary rehearsals began in August, with the object of discovering a suitable team and evolving the best method, and then a series of six experimental broadcasts was begun on 7 January. Public opinion was expertly tested both during the series and afterwards, and the results clearly demonstrated a demand for the new feature. Most careful reports were prepared by the Statistics experts of the B.B.C., who, of course, have no interest in this or any other particular programme, and a number of remarkable facts emerged.

Despite the bad listening time, an average of more than four million listened to the Anvil. The audience for the Forces Programme is usually half as big again as that for the Home Service. Yet on all but two occasions the Anvil audience was actually bigger than that of the competing Forces programme. (On one occasion we had the extraordinary distinction of having three-quarters of a million more listeners than a Bing Crosby recorded programme!) The average for the last three broadcasts was considerably higher than that for the first three, and the number of appreciations increased notably as the series went on. In the end more than

600 le  
critici  
direct  
consi  
of lis  
Resea  
of An  
About  
tions-  
view  
answe  
and f  
per co  
9 per  
the g  
These  
the ex  
T  
Paul's  
fessor  
Histo  
the F  
Inter  
famil  
Profe  
Hull,  
We v  
chara  
to an  
happi  
alone  
tuniti  
was v  
comp  
great  
A mo  
oppo  
anoth  
decid  
spoke  
disting  
to be  
our C  
as a m  
do m  
Vo

600 letters of appreciation reached the B.B.C. as against about 60 letters of criticism—this, of course, quite apart from the large number of letters sent direct to members of the team. And the number of questions sent in considerably exceeded 4000. After the series was completed a large panel of listeners comprising the Talks and Discussion Panel of the Listener Research Bureau were asked whether they would welcome a further series of Anvil broadcasts, the answer to be “Yes”, “No”, or “It all depends”. About a quarter said “It all depends”, and suggested a number of modifications—a better listening time, representatives of all religious points of view and even of the non-religious standpoint; longer, more complete answers; or, on the other hand, shorter, snappier answers; more “practical” and fewer “theological” questions. Of the remaining three-quarters, 91 per cent gave an unqualified welcome to the resumption of the series and 9 per cent opposed it. It is to be noticed that these panels are drawn from the general public and not from those known to be interested in religion. These figures revealed an interest in the programme which far surpassed the expectations of the B.B.C. and of the members of the team.

The team for these first broadcasts was Canon F. A. Cockin of St. Paul's, a well-known Anglican preacher and successful broadcaster; Professor R. D. Whitehorn, an English Presbyterian, Professor of Church History at Westminster College, Cambridge, and this year's Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council; Miss Mary Trevelyan, warden of an International Students' Settlement in London, member of a well-known family and daughter of the famous historian; and myself. The chairman was Professor Victor Murray, Professor of Education at University College, Hull, a man with wide knowledge and experience of the Free Churches. We were asked to work together as a unit and yet to preserve our own characteristic points of view, not shirking differences and not pretending to any agreement which did not exist. In fact, our relations were of the happiest. On a number of occasions listeners—and not Catholic listeners alone—complained that I was being unfairly treated, being denied opportunities of speaking and being treated with discourtesy. The accusation was unfounded. I was much the youngest member of the team and a complete stranger to all the others. Yet at all times I was treated with the greatest friendliness and respect both by my colleagues and by the B.B.C. A more common complaint, and perhaps a more justifiable one, took the opposite point of view. We were too “sweetly reasonable” with one another, and pulled our punches. My chief difficulty in this matter was to decide on a definite policy in my answers. Whenever any of the others spoke there were nearly always a dozen objections to be raised and a dozen distinctions to be made. But I soon discovered that there was not going to be time to do all this and then to proceed to deal with the matter from our Catholic point of view. The whole experiment presented itself to me as a most wonderful opportunity of the Apostolate. I decided that I could do more good by brief, clear, positive statements of Catholic teaching than

by scoring debating points, however effectively. I made up my mind to make points rather than to score points, and to endeavour on all occasions to leave the listener—often completely ignorant and sometimes hostile—with a clear and attractive outline of the Catholic doctrine involved in the question, as far as was in my power; but always prepared to intervene when my silence might have given a wrong impression of our position.

Judging by the official reports and by our own correspondence our audience was drawn very evenly from members of all the religious bodies, and included hundreds of thousands who had no definite religious beliefs whatever. Here are some extracts from letters sent in:

"I've listened to the Anvil for the last four Thursdays, though I've never been in church in my life except to get married. I had no idea religion could be so interesting or intelligent." (Rolls-Royce factory worker. Glasgow.)

"Quite a good Anvil last night. Original Sin as bad as it always is—the Roman impossible. Euthanasia very good." (Anglican parson.)

"Talk in language we can understand. We haven't all been to Universities." (G.W.R. ganger.)

"The best broadcasts I've ever heard. Keep them on." (Engineer shop-steward and Labour Party leader. Manchester.)

"I think one of the greatest features was the humaneness and reality of both questions and answers. It was much more interesting because of this than the other Brains Trust. I think it's going to help a lot of people because they are just the doubts people are wanting answered. This seems a first-rate effort by those with an understanding to meet the need." (Girl in Ministry of Food. Non-Christian.)

"The Anvil was the main subject of discussion in our shop this morning. We could do with more facts and more thrashing-out." (Man in Metro-Vicks. Old Trafford.)

"You stupid, lazy-minded, one-layer-thinking old men. Don't you see that ordinary sensible people are exasperated when they see the Church maundering at length about unimportant details instead of putting their strength and energy into ridding the world of war, slums and poverty. I don't mean merely talking about it, but doing it. What a chance you miss." (Anon.)

"Longer, please, and an earlier hour. This has been needed for a long time." (Four teachers. London.)

"You struck some splendid sparks from the Anvil last night. My feeling was that the whole thing was worth while and interesting. But I didn't like your mixture of questions. I feel that the Anvil is really meant to strike sparks to kindle cold or hostile people, or muddled ones." (Y.W.C.A. worker.)

And there were many hundreds of letters of appreciation and thanks sent to the B.B.C. and to members of the team, some of them most touch-

ing and consoling. There were many letters asking for guidance and advice in personal difficulties. Others sought further enlightenment on questions discussed, and some asked to be put in touch with a priest or minister of religion for instruction. A small proportion of the letters were critical. A few were hostile or abusive. But the number of these was small and the proportion was infinitesimal. The Catholic representative was treated with great fairness by correspondents and listening panels. I had as many letters from non-Catholics and as many expressions of approval from them as from our own people, who throughout were most generous and encouraging. And during the whole series I received only four hostile letters.

The Press reaction was interesting and, perhaps, instructive. The Catholic Press was splendid throughout. It supported the enterprise and encouraged Catholics to support it, while being discriminating in its approval of the broadcasts. The work of the three weekly popular papers did much to establish the Anvil with our Catholic people. After the first broadcast *The Church Times* gave one highly critical column, and then relapsed into unbroken silence. The Free Church papers ignored it completely from beginning to end, and during the series one of them carried an article demanding that the ordinary Brains Trust should be allowed to deal with religious and political questions. *The Listener*, after the first broadcast, wondered whether this was going to be an Anvil or a Meccano set, brass tacks or just old iron, and pressed for the introduction of one non-religious member into the team. *The Manchester Guardian* praised it, and thought that one of these broadcasts might do more good than a hundred sermons. *The Observer* gave it an Editorial embodying a good deal of criticism. It accused the B.B.C. of neglecting the smaller religious bodies, wanted them all represented, and wanted more fire and fury. Despite all the efforts of the Publicity Dept. of the B.B.C., almost all the National Press remained unaware of us, with one or two minor exceptions. We once crept timidly into the column of a certain Mr. Hannen Swaffer, who chatters brightly in one of the national dailies, and were promptly annihilated by him. Publicity experts inform me that there is a certain distinction in achieving a gossip column, and that public execution confers notoriety if not lasting fame. When the series concluded its prearranged run *The News Chronicle* informed the world that the Anvil had been a failure and would not return. Whereupon *The Daily Mail* informed the world that it had been a great success, credited it with far more questions than it had ever received, and forecast a speedy revival. When the threat of our return became imminent, William Hickey, whose notice we had escaped during our six weeks of life, revealed that he had known us all the time, but that we had been dull and wooden. And *The News Chronicle* announced that we were coming back after all, flourishing our 4000 questions, which, it was at pains to point out, testified to the great public interest in religious matters but not at all to the quality of the answers provided by the Anvil. A number of people,



including several priests, have alleged bad faith and downright ill-will on the part of some of the Press, and have adduced evidence in support of their theory. I very much question whether this is so. But there is certainly a great contrast between the picture as seen in the various disinterested reports and that reflected in the Press. On this point many of the great papers neither led nor reflected public opinion.

The questions sent in were extraordinarily interesting, and served as a very salutary corrective to our preconceived notions as to what people were asking or saying. Each day during the series the members of the team received a classified list of all questions sent in, with name and address of the sender, where provided, so that we were able to see where public interest lay, and to see the "follow up" to our answers. Each answer produced a further spate of questions on the subject and we might have returned to the same question again and again. A number of the questions arose out of immediate circumstances. There were many on the Soul, Survival after Death and Immortality; a large number on the Irreconcilability of Christianity and War; many on social and political problems; a very large number on Co-operation of the Churches, and the Reunion of Christendom, two separate questions which seemed to be linked up together in the minds of many enquirers; a large number on modern issues in the Education question; a fair number on the problem of pain and suffering; on the value of prayer; about a hundred on specifically Catholic matters. Surprisingly few on subjects like Marriage and Divorce, or Contraception; hardly any on many of the great doctrinal questions; a few on Drink and Gambling; and, most surprising of all, throughout the whole series only nine on Communism. Here are a few samples, unedited, from one day's bag:

"How is it that one often finds the apparently Christian solution to many of our problems (i.e. the solution that breathes the spirit of Christ), especially in the social and international sphere, coming from those outside rather than from those inside the Church?"

"In the light of Christian teaching, what should be our attitude to Germany and Germans after the war?"

"What place have Ceremony and Ornament in worship? Are they not mere distractions that obscure true religion and hide it from many seekers, helping the devil rather than Christ?"

"In the past fifty years scientific and material progress has increased out of all proportion since the creation of man thousands of years ago. Where does the Anvil think this sudden acceleration of everything is leading to? Is it inspired by God?"

"Does the Anvil accept the theory of Evolution? Can it be reconciled with Christian belief?"

"Please can the R.C. priest tell us why his Church teaches that unless you are married in the R.C. Church by a priest you are not married in the eyes of God?"

"I have heard that the R.C. Church does not allow its members to read the Bible for themselves. Can the Anvil tell me if this is a fact, and why?"

"What is the Roman Catholic concept of Divine Law? How is it arrived at and on what authority? Is the celibacy of the clergy in accordance with this Law? Can the *Index Expurgatorius* be defended by it? Is it ever lawful to go against it?"

"Why can't Roman Catholics pray with other Christians? How can there be any co-operation and any Christian charity if we cannot stand together in prayer before our common Father?"

"To what extent do you think laxity on the part of parents in bringing up their children is responsible for the evils in the world today?"

"If Christ was really God how could He cry out on the Cross, 'My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken Me'?"

"What is the meaning of the word 'Christian' in the world today? Do I need to go to church to be a Christian?"

"If God is love, why does He not stop this terrible war?"

"What authentic evidence can the Religious Brains Trust produce to prove that the ecclesiastical organization, and it only, was appointed by God to reveal His Will to mankind?"

Most of the questions expressed real difficulties; a few were attempts to catch us out. Remarkably few were leg-pulls, although one was asked us "Is your journey really necessary?" The system of selecting questions for answer was as fair as we could contrive. We would select the five or six subjects most in demand and then try to find a question with as many of the main points in it as possible; and we would try to answer that, bearing other similar questions in mind. Our infallibility was often called in question, and we were often wrong in our anticipation of the reception accorded to our answers. We expected a lot of trouble, for instance, after an answer dealing with the anti-religious character of Communism. In fact, we got only two mild letters of protest. Whereas an answer in which Canon Cockin and I had said that we didn't think that war would ever be completely eliminated provoked a perfect storm of dissent, and even some abuse. One of the most interesting reactions was provoked by the answer to a question concerning the historical character of the opening chapters of Genesis. I had given our Catholic teaching on the point, keeping close to the decisions of the Biblical Commission and stating our teaching as simply and as sympathetically as I could. Others, especially the chairman and Professor Whitehorn, disagreed strongly, saying that Genesis enshrined the basic truths of Creation and ultimate dependence on God in mythical form, Moses being, perhaps, the first historical personage in the Bible. And they claimed that my opinion was peculiar to Roman Catholics and was contrary to the opinion of modern scholarship. I retorted that very many Protestants shared my point of view, which was based on solid

scholarship, and not only, as they had suggested, on authority. Immediately a torrent of letters broke on me. A few accused me of obscurantism. One, from a well-known Catholic, told me that by that answer I had brought ridicule on myself and on the Church and had undone all the excellent work the Anvil had accomplished. But I received many dozens thanking me for defending the Scriptures, almost all from non-Catholics. There were letters from Anglican clergy, and from Free Church ministers; one from the principal of a great training college for teachers; from doctors, lawyers, teachers; and many from humble folk of all kinds. Some praised God that the Catholic Church was there to defend Christian teaching, although they protested they could not accept all her teaching. Others were disturbed and shocked at what they thought was the abandonment of the Scriptures by their leaders. Many declared that they had discovered during the Anvil that they had been mistaken in their view of the Church, and some asked for books or for further guidance. A week or so after that broadcast I met by chance a well-known Anglican thinker. He brought up the matter. "Of course, you had to say that. You don't really believe it. It just happens to be your official teaching for the time being." I protested that, incredible though it must sound to him, I really did believe it. "Impossible. Surely So-and-So doesn't hold that"—mentioning a well-known Catholic intellectual. I assured him that So-and-So quite certainly did. "How you people must suffer if you have any minds at all!" he said, and he left me, pitying me at having to prostitute my intellect at the bidding of an authoritarian Church.

I have observed as a result of my recent experiences that the enormous and profound Catholic scholarship in Dogmatic Theology and Scripture study is little known even to sympathetic non-Catholics, and being unknown is often presumed to be non-existent. One obvious reason is that little of our greatest work in this field is in English. Another is that we seldom or never meet Anglicans or Free Churchmen in discussion or debate. And there is consequently a tendency to brush aside our teaching as being merely "articles of faith", perhaps devoid of intellectual significance. A Presbyterian wrote concerning my answer on Original Sin: "The friar gave the right definition, but with him it is not a technical term but an article of faith." And quite often one felt conscious of the unspoken comment: "Yes, I know that is what you say. But what do you think—that is, if you can now think at all?" And there is also a feeling among these men who have studied beside many of the present-day leaders in many fields of thought, and who are, in many cases, in close personal contact with them, that we, perforce, are out of touch with the scholarship of the country and do not appreciate it at its true worth. Other points transpired in correspondence and in discussions, especially the great significance attached to religious experience; and, arising out of that, the retreat from the objective both in matters of belief and of morals; the changing concept of the nature and purpose of Revelation; the progressive

decl  
foun  
cipl  
tion  
men  
sess  
be  
of a

offic  
min  
Thi  
time  
diffi  
tuni  
beca  
ever  
in a  
ting  
say,  
abou  
afra  
me  
Hol  
at t  
stre  
very  
prie  
you  
isola

I  
a  
crea  
this  
and  
then

decline in the idea of the Church as a teaching body. Time after time I found it impossible to argue or discuss without harking back to first principles. We would reach agreement in the solution of question after question, but I was always conscious of wide divergences on the most fundamental points of all. I don't think it will ever be possible during Anvil sessions really to thrash these matters out. I don't know whether it would be desirable even if we could. Yet these are the most important matters of all, implicit in almost every question that arises.

It was made clear at the beginning of the series that we were in no way official spokesmen for our Churches, but there is no doubt that in the minds of most listeners we spoke for the body to which we belonged. This was particularly true in my case, and it brought with it a great and, at times, overwhelming sense of responsibility. I had undertaken the work diffidently when high authority had put it before me as a unique opportunity of the Apostolate. As the work progressed the truth of this view became more and more apparent and the possibilities opened up on an ever-increasing scale. It was an extraordinary experience to sit at a table in a little room in the heart of London knowing that thousands were getting their first direct impressions of the Church from what you might say, and that your lightest word might affect thousands in their opinions about the Church in the modern world. At times one became almost afraid of the responsibility. Cardinal Hinsley, when he wrote encouraging me to go on, had reminded me that prayer and a great confidence in the Holy Spirit would avail me more than mere cleverness and astuteness, and at times one had the most extraordinary sense of being sustained and strengthened by the prayers of countless souls all over the country. It is a very wonderful thing to go into an undertaking of this kind as a Catholic priest. You have a security and a certainty denied to others, and, above all, you have the sense of being one of the household of the Faith, never isolated or alone.

F. AGNELLUS ANDREW, O.F.M.

---

---

### DOES GOD CAUSE ANY EVIL?

**I**S it a part of Christian doctrine that God cannot be the cause of any evil, and that all the ills in the universe are caused solely by the misuse of creaturely freedom? Mr. Joad, at any rate, is under the impression that this is the "Christian hypothesis"; he summarises it in these words: "Pain and evil were not created by God. How, indeed, could He have created them, since He is all good? They are, therefore, the offspring of man."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *God and Evil*, Faber & Faber, p. 34.

Upon what Christian sources Mr. Joad has chiefly relied is not very clear; certainly not upon St. Thomas Aquinas, who, although he has written copiously and learnedly enough on the problem of evil and its causation to have deserved some mention, is not once quoted in his book. I suspect, however, that for his knowledge of the Christian solution he has drawn largely upon a recent book by Mr. C. S. Lewis, a writer who, though he has many merits which have been justly and generally acknowledged, is himself the first to disclaim that of being an authoritative exponent of Christian doctrine.<sup>1</sup> Indeed this author proposes his explanation of the origin of pain with such diffidence, and his work is so deserving of praise on other grounds, that it becomes almost ungracious, however necessary it may be, to disagree with him. Nor am I by any means certain that it is his opinion which Mr. Joad intends to expound. It does not appear, for example, that Mr. Lewis commits himself to the general statement that God cannot be the cause of any evil. Nevertheless I find that his version of the origin of pain in men and animals does in fact imply that these evils are not caused by God, and therefore to this extent at least Mr. Joad is the faithful interpreter of his thought. For according to the author of *The Problem of Pain*, the human nature which is liable to pain and death is "a new species, *never made by God*" which "has sinned itself into existence",<sup>2</sup> and the animal nature which suffers pain is the outcome (though here Mr. Lewis confesses that he is in the realm of conjecture) of the corruption of beasts by Satanic action.<sup>3</sup>

The question therefore arises, out of at least two books which are now being widely read, whether this doctrine, that God is not the cause of any evil, or at all events that He is not the cause of pain and death, finds any support in Catholic theology.

There is none for it, certainly, in the teaching of St. Thomas. Of sin, which is the deliberate rebellion of the finite will against the Creator, of sin, which is evil *par excellence*, God clearly cannot be the cause.<sup>4</sup> The heretical doctrine of Calvin on this point, besides being repulsive, involves a metaphysical contradiction. But of punishment, which is the evil that the sinner suffers in retribution, God is the author. If the sinner is said to be the cause of his own punishment this is to be understood only in a "dispositive" sense, inasmuch as he makes himself deserving of chastisement: "*Deus est auctor poenae*".<sup>5</sup> Herein St. Thomas is the disciple of St. Augustine, who, answering the claim of Colluthus that God causes no evil, quotes Isaiah xlv, 7, and robustly asserts: "*Creat Deus mala, poenas justissimas irrogando*".<sup>6</sup> God is also the cause of the natural corruption or decay

<sup>1</sup> *The Problem of Pain*. Geoffrey Bles. See Preface, p. viii, and p. 60.

<sup>2</sup> Op. cit., p. 71; italics mine.

<sup>3</sup> Op. cit., pp. 122-123.

<sup>4</sup> *De malo*, I, art. 5.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. Cf. I-IIae, q. 87, art. 1, ad 2; I, q. 49, art. 2.

<sup>6</sup> *L. lib. de haeresibus*, P.L. 42, col. 42.

to which material things are subject—what the scholastics called *malum naturae*. The concept of efficient cause (“that which by its action gives being or perfection to another”) combined with the concept of evil (“the deprivation of being or perfection”) shows it to be impossible that evil should have a direct cause, or a cause *per se*. Physical evil is caused in a thing indirectly or *per accidens*; it is a by-product of direct causation. The incoming perfection which is caused *per se* displaces another perfection with which its presence is incompatible, so that the deprivation of this is caused indirectly. Since God is the first cause and prime mover of all natural agents, it follows that He is the first cause (*per accidens*) of the corruption or decay which their action necessarily involves: “*Malum quod in corruptione rerum aliquarum consistit reducitur in Deum sicut in causam. . . . Aliquod agens, in quantum sua virtute producit aliquam formam ad quam sequitur corruptio et defectus, causat sua virtute illam corruptionem et defectum.*”<sup>1</sup>

Pain is a particular instance of physical evil, being the psychological state by which lesion or decay reveals itself in a sentient organism; it is *sensus laesionis*.<sup>2</sup> Since an animal is a vital organic unity it is natural that when it *is* unwell it should also *feel* unwell. Pain is an evil, because it is the deprivation of the sense of well-being; but it is not an evil precisely in so far as it is a sense, or a feeling. From this point of view pain is positive, and therefore good: “Once granted the presence of something harmful,” writes St. Thomas, “it is good to experience pain from the evil which is present”; it is good because it is the normal functioning of the sentient faculty in the circumstances. In other words, it is an evil that an animal should suffer injury and consequently experience pain; but it is not an evil that pain should be experienced by an injured animal. Pain therefore, though an evil, is not an evil additional to the lesion of the organism itself.<sup>3</sup> There is thus no reason for holding that God is not the cause of pain. He is directly and *per se* the cause of the perfection of sensibility in animals; He is also directly the cause of the action of that faculty; being the cause *per accidens* of the lesion and decay of animals so far as these defects are the result of natural activities, He is therefore also the cause *per accidens* of their pain.<sup>4</sup>

In the category of beings liable to decay, and therefore to pain and death, man holds a unique position which the Angelic Doctor fully appreciates. Man has a spiritual soul which is incapable of corruption; in him the tendency to decay arises wholly and solely from the material body of which his soul

<sup>1</sup> I, q. 49, art. 2. Cf. *Contra Gentes*, III, 10. God is not the cause of sin, because this does not follow necessarily from the nature of man.

<sup>2</sup> *De Ver.*, q. 26, art. 4, ad 4.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. I-IIae, q. 39, art. 1 & 2. It is, of course, true *absolutely* speaking (i.e. abstracting from the subject in which the evil is found) that decay unaccompanied by pain is a lesser evil than painful decay; and the reason is that the former is the deprivation of a lesser perfection. Anaesthetics lessen the evil of disease only inasmuch as, by eliminating sensibility, they temporarily lessen the perfection of the subject.

<sup>4</sup> Since evil has no cause *per se*, any subsequent statements in this article regarding the cause of evil are to be understood of its cause *per accidens*.

is the substantial form. He is therefore the subject of a natural tension between the spiritual and the material, which issues in his consciousness under the form of aspirations to immortality, and above all in the conflict between spiritual and animal desire which theologians call concupiscence. Human nature is, as it were, the bridge which spans the abyss between the material and the spiritual, and, like all bridges, it is subjected to a constant strain. St. Thomas well expresses this truth when he observes that, had nature been able to find an incorruptible body for this spiritual soul, it would have provided it. Nevertheless, man is not soul merely; it is his nature to be body-soul; it is accordingly natural to him to be corruptible as to the body, and therefore passible and mortal.<sup>1</sup>

This mysterious union in man of the spiritual with the material has been a perennial puzzle to philosophers. The Origenists suggested that we are angels imprisoned in bodies for our sins; the Manicheans that we are particles of God enclosed in material integuments which the Evil One has fashioned. The theologians of the Reform succumbed to a similar pessimism when they concluded that this anomaly of spirit in corruptible body could not possibly be the work of God; the human nature which is subject to concupiscence, pain and death could be nothing but the product of human sin, an essentially degraded and intrinsically vitiated form of the humanity which God had made. And Baius, too, though he shrank from the Lutheran excesses, felt constrained to assert that passible and mortal man could only be a maimed and mutilated version of the divine handiwork.<sup>2</sup> And was not this, they asked, the teaching of the Scriptures, which reveal man to us in his original and natural state before he spoiled himself by sin? The true nature of man requires him to be united with God by charity, free from concupiscence and suffering, and immortal.

The answer of the Church is well known: the original state of man was not his natural condition; the grace and charity which united him with God were supernatural gifts; the "integrity" which gave him complete control over his emotions was preternatural; gratuitous likewise was the dispensation which preserved him from corruption, pain and death. The same answer had already been given by St. Thomas. Intensely aware though he is of the "pull" of the soul towards an incorruptible body, he understands that a material body is naturally corruptible and he therefore refuses to move from his position that the human compound is naturally dissoluble, and that decay, pain and death are the necessary concomitants of human nature as such. He is well aware also that according to Catholic doctrine these defects are the effect of original sin; but this, he explains, is so only because the sin of Adam deprived humanity of the gratuitous "original justice" which had rendered it immune from them. When this gift was lost, "the nature of the human body was left to itself" and followed the natural

<sup>1</sup> I-IIac, q. 85, art. 6; cf. I, q. 75, art. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Prop. 55 & 78, condemned by Pius V. Denzinger 1055, 1078.



path of corruption.<sup>1</sup> Therefore of human pain and death also, since He alone is the author of human nature, God is the cause.

On the subject of pain and death in the animal kingdom Catholic theologians are comparatively reticent, perhaps because from the theological point of view there is not very much to be said. It is assumed that these defects, which are natural to rational animals, are *a fortiori* natural to brute animals also. At all events, a careful search in the works of leading theologians has failed to reveal any confirmation of the hypothesis that they are caused by Satan's interference with animal nature. For the rest it would be difficult to reconcile such a theory with what is generally held regarding angelic power. That Lucifer's sin did not deprive him of any of his natural gifts, nor, consequently, of the great influence which angels are able naturally to exert upon material things, is generally agreed; it is certain, moreover, that as a result of human sin both man and the material creation became subject to a certain domination of Satan. But the power of angels over material things, though presumably considerable, is strictly limited; it is limited within the bounds of the divine permission, and above all it is limited within the bounds of the natural order divinely established. "Whatever an angel or any other creature does by his own power," says St. Thomas, "is done according to the order of created nature." An angel's superior knowledge enables him to manipulate natural forces with great ingenuity and thus to produce marvellous effects; but he has no power to tamper with the nature of things, of which God alone is the Author.<sup>2</sup> He could not, therefore, cause a "naturally" incorruptible animal to be subject to decay.

The only hypothesis connecting animal suffering with sin which I have been able to find entertained by any authoritative Catholic theologians attributes corruptibility in the material creation to a change brought about in it, not by Satan, but by God, and not by reason of angelic sin, but by reason of the sin of man. The theory is therefore, strictly speaking, irrelevant to our present enquiry which seeks Catholic support for the contention that animal pain is *not* caused by God; it is nevertheless sufficiently interesting to be worth a brief consideration. Such vogue as it has enjoyed, and still enjoys, seems to be due to the authority of St. John Chrysostom who, followed by a number of the early Fathers, understood in this sense the much debated passage (Rom. viii, 19-22) in which St. Paul represents the material world as groaning under the law of "vanity" and yearning for deliverance from "the servitude of corruption". According to Chrysostom's interpretation, when God cursed the earth because of Adam's sin (Gen. iii, 17) He subjected irrational creation to the law of mutability and corruption, a condition from which it will be liberated only in the day of

<sup>1</sup> I-IIae, q. 85, art. 5 & 6.

<sup>2</sup> I, q. 110, art. 4; *Contra Gentes*, II, 43; cf. St. Aug., *De Trin.*, lib. iii, cap. 16-18.

the final consummation, when the new heavens and the new earth will be founded (II Peter ii, 13; Apoc. xx, 1). This exegesis, which for the rest has been far from finding general acceptance,<sup>1</sup> is not without its theological difficulties. If, restricting the application of the hypothesis to animals, we are to conceive this "fall" in the animal kingdom by analogy with the fall of man—as we presumably must—it then becomes necessary to suppose that animals were originally endowed with preternatural incorruptibility, a supposition for which there is no sure authority in revelation. We are indeed told that man in the state of innocence possessed exceptional control over the beasts, which certainly argues preternatural power in man, but surely without requiring mutual forbearance among animals themselves,<sup>2</sup> still less their immunity from pain, decay, and death. St. Thomas is probably nearer to the Apostle's thought when he stresses the contrast, not so much between the present state of the material universe and an original state of incorruptibility, as between its present corruptibility and its future glory.<sup>3</sup>

One might at any rate have expected that such a view of the origin of animal pain would have found favour with that one among the Fathers who has never been accused of minimizing the effects of original sin. And yet St. Augustine, when he is asked to account for the fact that animals, although they are incapable of sin and cannot be improved by pain, nevertheless prey upon one another and inflict reciprocal suffering, does not answer that this state of affairs is due to the sin of man, still less does he attribute it to the

<sup>1</sup> For its history see Lagrange and Cornely, *in loc.*

<sup>2</sup> Gen. i, 26, ii, 20; cf. Eccli. xvii, 4. For a different view see L. Janssens, O.S.B., *Summa Theologica*, viii, pp. 195 ff. This author does not, however, attribute to animals original incorruptibility or impassibility.

<sup>3</sup> *In loc.* Cf. *Contra Gentes*, IV, 97, *init.* Animals, moreover, are excluded by St. Thomas from the future renovation of the material world. For his view as to the effect of human sin upon the inanimate creation it is not possible to refer the reader to any one passage of his works, since he does not appear to treat the question when dealing with the effects of original sin. His opinion has to be surmised from incidental remarks which occur in his speculations on the final glory of the material universe; and these again, conditioned as they are by the physics of his time, do not offer a very fruitful field of study. Nevertheless there are clear indications that the Angelic Doctor is loth to admit any real change as the result of the Fall. Thus, in answer to the suggestion that the sun's light was diminished on account of Adam's sin, he maintains as more probable the opinion that the real change took place not in the sun but in man, who received less benefit from its light; just as the earth, which had always produced thorns and thistles, now began to do so "in poenam hominis". "Nec tamen sequitur," he goes on, "si lux coelestium corporum per essentiam minorata non est homine peccante, quod realiter non sit augenda in ejus glorificatione; quia peccatum hominis non mutavit statum universi, cum etiam homo prius et post, animale vitam habuerit, quae motu et generatione creaturae corporalis indigeat. Sed glorificatio hominis statum totius creaturae corporalis immutabit, ut dictum est; et ideo non est simile" (IV *Sent.*, dist. 48, q. 2, art. 3, ad 3). Elsewhere he admits that human sin "infected" the corporeal creation, but in the sense in which a sacred place is desecrated by a crime which has been committed in it: "Ex culpa quaedam incongruitas in rebus corporalibus relinquitur, ad hoc quod spiritualibus dedicentur . . . et secundum hoc ex peccatis hominum quamdam inidoneitatem ad gloriam suscipiendam pars mundi recepit, quae in usum nostrum cedit" (IV *Sent.*, dist. 47, q. 2, art. 1).

action of Satan; he answers quite simply that the reason is because "some animals are the food of others".<sup>1</sup> He then goes on, characteristically, to point out that if the pain caused by animals to one another has no remedial value for them, it has nevertheless an educative value for us, who ought to learn from the skill and courage displayed by them in quest of their material welfare how much greater resolution and energy we ought to devote to gaining our eternal salvation. St. Thomas in like manner refuses to allow that the nature of animals was changed through the sin of man: "There are some who say," he writes, "that animals which are now savage and kill other animals would, in the state of innocence, have been tame and friendly not only towards man but also towards one another. But this is wholly unreasonable. The nature of animals was not changed through the sin of man, as though those to which it is now natural to eat the flesh of other animals would formerly have been herbivorous."<sup>2</sup>

However that may be, and whatever view be held as to the connection between human sin and animal corruptibility, it remains certain—and I can find no authoritative Catholic theologian who teaches otherwise—that any change which may have so resulted in the animal kingdom must have been efficiently caused by the Creator alone, "Maker of all things visible and invisible". In every admissible supposition, therefore, God remains the cause of animal pain and death.

It appears, then, that Catholic theologians do not encourage the opinion that pain and other physical evils are caused only by sin, whether human or angelic. So far as these defects are due to the normal activity of natural agents they are to be attributed to the efficient causality of the Creator. This does not mean that God creates evil things. That would be absurd. Physical evil is not a thing; it happens to things. Among God's creatures there are some whose nature is such that physical evil naturally and necessarily happens to them. Material things are not evil, but their tenure of their natural goodness is precarious, inasmuch as under the impact of other material things they are apt to lose their perfection and to decay. And we have heard St. Thomas argue that God, who is the author of material things and the cause of their natural activity, is consequently to be regarded as the cause of these defects: "*Malum quod in corruptione rerum aliquarum consistit reducitur in Deum sicut in causam.*"

Now it is clear that such a view of physical evil and its causation, if it is to be logically sustained, presupposes what we may call a "nature philosophy"; our constant use of the words nature and natural in the course of this article is sufficient indication of it. It implies that we are able to establish that physical evils occur as a necessary consequence of the action of material things; that we are able to know these things in such a way as

<sup>1</sup> *De Gen. ad litt.*, iii, 16.

<sup>2</sup> I, q. 96, art. 1, ad 2.

to grasp the link of necessity which connects decay or corruption with them; it supposes that our knowledge is not merely empirical, not confined to registering the bare facts of sensible experience, but that we are able also in the uniform behaviour and unvarying attributes of things to read (*intus legere*) the lineaments of the nature or essence which God their Author has given them, and by reason of which they necessarily are what they are and act necessarily in the way in which they do. Only in such a supposition is it possible for us to assert with confidence that a particular quality or operation is natural to a thing and that a different one transcends its natural condition; to assert, for example, that it is natural to the human body to decay, and therefore to conclude that, if man was originally constituted in a state in which his body would not decay, such an original condition was not natural but preternatural.

But neither the theologians of the Reform nor Baius (who achieved a great measure of agreement with them) accepted this nature philosophy. For them, reared in the nominalistic schools of the XVth century,<sup>1</sup> the only source from which it is possible to derive any certain knowledge of the nature of man is the Bible; the only natural state of man is that state in which he was originally placed by God. The great scholastics had discussed the "state of pure nature", an original state in which God might have created man, in which he would have had nothing more than was strictly due to his nature as such, and in which he would therefore have been subject to concupiscence, pain and death. Such a purely natural condition was repudiated by the Reformers as a mere fiction of the philosophers, a vain imagination which only those could entertain who preferred to be taught by Aristotle rather than by the Scriptures. In any case this "Aristotelian" nature, involving as it would so many evils for man, could never have been created by God. For the rest, what can the philosopher know of the nature of man? Man's nature is what God *willed* it to be, and God's will we can know only so far as He has revealed it in the Bible.<sup>2</sup> There we find man as he really is, adhering to God in loving worship, in perfect control of all his powers, impassible and immortal. If man is otherwise now it is because he has corrupted or mutilated human nature by his sin.

It has been truly observed that the theological doctrines of Luther and Baius were providential in emphasizing for Catholic theologians the basic distinction between the natural and the supernatural. It may be added that the supreme need of safeguarding this distinction furnishes a theological argument against the philosophy of Nominalism. For if the sole criterion by which we may know what constitutes the nature of man is that mysterious

<sup>1</sup> For the influence of Nominalism on Luther and the Reformers generally, see D. T. C., vol. IX, col. 1184-1189; on Baius, F.-X. Jansen, S.J., *Baius et le Baianisme*, Louvain, 1927, pp. 32, ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the answer of Karl Barth to a questioner: "I invite you not to form your estimate of man arbitrarily but to be guided by what the Holy Scriptures say of him." *God in Action*, Clark, Edinburgh, p. 123.

decree by which God gratuitously determined to endow him in a particular way, then it is evident that any perfections in man which are the result of that bounteous decree must form an essential part of his nature; the preternatural and the supernatural cease to have any intelligible meaning. And in fact for Baius and the Reformers there could be only the natural and the sub-natural: the natural is the state of human perfection which God willed and originally constituted; the sub-natural is the mottled pattern now existing, in which the God-given good is shot through with the evil of which man is the cause.

For the Catholic theologian, on the contrary, there are two spheres of religious knowledge, the natural and the supernatural, and in both spheres it is the divine truth that is made known to him. By supernatural faith he accepts the testimony of divine revelation, and thus he knows that man was originally impassible and immortal. On the other hand, to the light of unaided human reason the nature of man reveals itself as essentially mortal and subject to pain. This also is divine truth, for God is the author of the human mind and of the essences of things which it knows. Indeed it is because the nature of things as such bears the impress of the divine idea that man is able from the consideration of creatures to rise to a natural, though imperfect, knowledge of his Creator.<sup>1</sup> The Catholic theologian therefore combines the truth of both orders in his synthesis: God is the author, in the supernatural order, of man in his condition of original and gratuitous perfection; He is also the author of man's nature as such, and consequently the cause, in the sense explained, of the physical defects to which it is necessarily subject.

It has not been the purpose of this paper to throw any light upon the problem of evil. The specifically Christian contribution to that problem lies in the doctrine of redemptive suffering, and this needs more to be practised than to be expounded. To some it may appear that by attributing the causation of physical evil to the Creator I have tried to make matters more difficult rather than to simplify them. If so I am not ill-content with my effort. Problems which concern the relation of God with His creatures are never easy of solution, and if a solution appears to be simple we may be fairly sure that some important element of the problem has been overlooked, with unfortunate consequences. I have tried to indicate some of the consequences which may follow if we attempt to eliminate physical evil from the sphere of the divine causality.

G. D. SMITH.

---

<sup>1</sup> Wisdom xiii, 1-9; Rom. i, 18-20.

### THE PEACE HOPES OF ST. THOMAS MORE AND ERASMUS

AFTER the firm establishment of the Roman Empire, there ensued a long period of peace. Many bloody civil wars had preceded it; there had been many campaigns for the subjugation of the surrounding nations. Yet when at last the Pax Romana was attained, it brought the greatest benefits to the whole known civilized world. True it is that from time to time the Christians were grievously persecuted; there were, too, occasional skirmishes on the frontiers. Yet, on the whole, for some two centuries the arts of peace were pursued, literature flourished, trade and commerce were expanded, and the citizens of the Empire enjoyed an unparalleled prosperity which provoked the envy of the surrounding barbarians, and in the end occasioned those repeated attacks under which it succumbed.

The renaissance scholars of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries hoped by the revival of literature after the classical models, by the use of Latin as an universal language, by the spread of culture and gentle manners, by the influence of the humanistic sentiment of the brotherhood of man, to inaugurate a similar golden age of peace and prosperity, and to make war an anachronism.

We may illustrate this point of view from the writings of two of the greatest figures of the renaissance, St. Thomas More and Erasmus. The Saint's sentiments are best known to us from his *Utopia*, while Erasmus's are taken chiefly from his *Institutio Principis Christiani* and his *Querela Pacis*.<sup>1</sup> At once we may be struck by the coincidence of dates. What is now Book II of the *Utopia* was written in Flanders in the summer of 1515 and Book I in London during the summer of the following year. It was in that same year 1516 that Erasmus wrote the *Institutio*, and in the following year the *Querela*. If, in addition, we recall the fact that Erasmus stayed at More's house in Bucklersbury during the summer of 1516 we shall not be surprised at the similarity of ideas to be noticed between them. Both had anticipated their views in earlier works, More in his Latin poems and epigrams, written at various dates; Erasmus in his letters and in the *Panegyricus* which in 1504 he addressed to Philip of Burgundy.

The hopes of Erasmus are expressed in a letter written in 1515 to the young Pope Leo X. He compares him to Solomon, the king of peace who had succeeded the warrior-king David, as Leo had the fierce Julius II. Never sparing of flattery, he goes further and ventures even to liken the Pope to Him of whom Solomon was the type, to Christ the Prince of Peace. "Most suitable it is," he continues, "that literature and the arts, the offspring of peace, should flourish again under the Pope by whom peace and quiet, the fosterers of study, are restored to the earth."

<sup>1</sup> The Society for the Promotion of Peace issued *Extracts from the Writings of Erasmus of the Subject of War*. London, 1817.

Similarly in a letter written in February of the following year to Francis I, whom he praises for the restoration of peace—"it has come especially by your efforts"—he writes that all evils come from war, but "if peace and sincere friendship unite the hearts and the resources of kings, a golden age will soon be established in which piety, just laws, and all the arts will flourish, for they are always found in the company or in the wake of peace." Erasmus spoke too soon, for in another letter we find that seven months later peace had not yet been concluded, nor, we fear, did Francis ever deserve Erasmus's praise for peaceful policy.

St. Thomas a few years earlier had, in a similar way, greeted the accession of Henry VIII in a *Carmen Gratulatorium*. The new king, heir both to the Yorkist and to the Lancastrian lines, is greeted as inaugurating a period of peace, joy, and prosperity. "What may not be hoped for from one who has so assiduously cultivated philosophy and the muses?" As to external enemies, they are not to be feared *sit tantum concors Anglia*—words which anticipate Shakespeare's "If England to itself do rest but true." But More's hopes of Henry VIII were to prove as fallacious as Erasmus's of Francis I.

Both writers insist on the brotherhood of man and the consequent fratricidal character of war. Thus Erasmus in the *Querela*. "The Frenchman is regarded as an enemy by the Englishman, for no other reason than that he is a Frenchman. The Scot is hateful to the Englishman for no other reason than that he is a Scot. The German quarrels with the Frenchman, the Spaniard with both. How wicked of men to allow themselves to be separated by a mere local name, when by so many things they are made one! As an Englishman you hate a Frenchman. Why do you not rather, as a man, love your fellow man, and as a Christian love your fellow-Christian? Why is a frivolous distinction more powerful than the many bonds of nature and of Christianity? Bodies may be divided in space, but not souls. The Rhine may separate German from Frenchman, but not Christian from Christian. The Pyrenees divide Frenchmen from Spaniards, but they do not divide the Church's communion. The sea cuts off England from France, but they are united by the bond of religion."

More re-echoes the thought. His Utopians did not enter into leagues with their neighbours, "for this causeth men (as though nations which be separate asunder, by the space of a little hill or a river, were coupled together by no society or bond of nature) to think themselves born adversaries and enemies one to another, and that it were lawful for the one to seek the death and destruction of the other, if leagues were not."

St. Thomas does not here insist, as does Erasmus, upon the fact of their common Christianity, for he makes his Utopians pagans—thus better, by his description of their natural goodness, to shame the wickedness of so many professing Christians.

Again, both writers characterize war as, literally, a beastly thing. More begins his account of warfare in *Utopia* thus: "War, or battle, as a thing very



beastly (*res plane belluina*), and yet to no kinds of beasts in so much use as to man, they do detest and abhor." Erasmus elaborates the same thought: "The viper does not bite its fellow, nor does one lynx tear another. Moreover when these animals fight, it is only with the weapons with which nature has provided them. Men are born without weapons, but, O Heavens, what weapons their malice contrives! Christians attack their fellow Christians with diabolical contrivances. Who would ever believe that bombards were a human invention? Nor do beasts march out in such closely serried ranks to mutual slaughter. Who ever saw ten lions fight with ten bulls? But how often do not twenty thousand Christians fight with an equal number of their co-religionists! . . . Nor do beasts usually fight at all unless hunger or the care of their young enrages them, etc."

More's deep tenderness of heart extended even to the brute creation. He kept a collection of strange animals in his garden and delighted in showing off his pets to his visitors. Erasmus has preserved the memory of one such visit. Accordingly the Utopians regard the trade of the butcher, however necessary (for More was no faddist), as degrading, and relegate it outside the city walls. Hunting they esteem madness. "What greater pleasure is there to be felt, when a dog followeth a hare, than when a dog followeth a dog? For one thing is done in both, that is to say, running, if thou hast pleasure therein. But if the hope of slaughter and the expectation of tearing in pieces the beast doth please thee, thou shouldst rather be moved with pity to see a poor miserable hare murdered of a dog, the weak of the stronger, the fearful of the fierce, the innocent of the cruel and unmerciful."

Fiercer still was his hatred of cruelty amongst men. In the *Utopia* there is much that is whimsical and fanciful, but there is no mistaking the sincerity of the burning indignation with which he denounces the wrongs of the poor and the helpless. Especially did he pity the innocent peasants who so often were the chief sufferers in war, and the maimed and broken men who came back from the wars and, having no means of livelihood, were driven so often to a life of crime, and finished their days upon the gallows. Yet, realist as he was, he knew that wars were sometimes absolutely just and inevitable. His Utopians, then, if forced to fight, were incredibly brave and even fierce, but they used every possible device to avoid war, or, if it could not be avoided, at least to shorten it and to save bloodshed. If the devices they employed seem sometimes mean and dishonourable, More probably intends to pillory the practices he saw around him.

Erasmus would have fully agreed in adopting almost any means to stave off war. For him it is the greatest of evils. If the Utopians bought off their enemies, he would have considered it an excellent use of their money, and a far less expense than the war would have entailed. Again and again he quotes Cicero as holding that an unjust peace is far preferable to the justest of wars, and adds, for his own part, that discretion is the better part of

valour (*felicius est effugere bellum quam fortiter gerere*). Though the Turks were an ever-present menace at that period to the very existence of Christendom, yet he is by no means enthusiastic about fighting against them. If Christians must fight, he says, it is no doubt better that they should fight against the Turks than among themselves, but their duty is by good example to convert the Turks, not to kill them. War will not convert them, but is more likely to make the Christians as bad as the Turks.

It is clear that the gentle scholar, whose delicacy and sensitiveness are so skilfully portrayed in Quentin Matsys' well-known portrait, was not cast in an heroic mould. He confesses that he was not of the stuff of which martyrs are made. Yet one cannot doubt the sincerity of his hatred for war and his pity for its victims. He could never understand why men did not give up fighting, in order to devote themselves to the delights of Latin and Greek.

His fellow-humanists were fully in sympathy with him. Martin van Dorp, for instance, writes to Francis Cranevelt (both men were friends and correspondents of both More and Erasmus): "We seem everywhere to be engaged in war, like wild beasts or demons, without end, without limit, without reason. A whole volume would not suffice to express one's detestation of the evil thing. Our dear friend, Erasmus, has written so much on the subject, with such Christian piety and eloquence, that he would melt even hearts of iron. But the hearts of princes are obstinate, rigid, and harder than any iron, brass or adamant."

Both More and Erasmus saw clearly enough the causes of war, and directed their keenest shafts of satire against the cupidity and frivolous quarrels of kings. In the *Utopia* mention is made of another fanciful people, the Acoriens, who politely, but firmly, informed their king, when he had conquered to himself a second kingdom, "that they gave him free choice to keep whichever one of the two kingdoms he would, alleging that he was not able to keep both, and that they were more than might well be governed by half a king, forasmuch as no man would be content to take him for his muleteer that keepeth another man's mules besides his".

So too Erasmus: "I am ashamed to say from what trifles fierce wars have arisen, and from how small a spark immense conflagrations. Then a whole train of supposed injuries comes into mind, and everyone exaggerates the evils he has suffered. On the other hand, the benefits he has received are utterly forgotten, so that you would imagine that war was a thing to be desired. Often it is some private grievance of princes which involves the whole world in the struggle. But surely an adequate cause for war should be the most public of all things. Sometimes when princes can find no ground for war, they even put forward fictitious ones, etc."

In a conversation with his son-in-law Roper, which seems to belong to the year 1529, St. Thomas mentioned three things which, if only he could see well established, he would be willing, as he quaintly said, to be put into a sack and cast into the Thames. "The first is that, whereas the most part

of Christian princes be at mortal war, they were all at an universal peace." Before the year was out it was given to More to make a very substantial contribution to that end. His diplomatic success on this occasion is the only event of his public life which he recalls in the curious epitaph which he composed for himself. More says he had been sent on various embassies, "and last of all at Cambrai, joined fellow and companion with Cuthbert Tunstall . . . where he both joyfully saw and was present ambassador, when the leagues between the chief princes of Christendom were renewed again, and peace, so long looked for, restored to Christendom. Which peace our Lord stable and make perpetual". It lasted, alas, only thirteen years.

The dream of the humanists remained unfulfilled. Far from a universal peace being established, the nations have become more and more sharply divided one against another. Even a common religion can no longer, as it was in the early sixteenth century, be a ground of appeal. Exaggerated nationalism has been the occasion of fearful wars. The Pax Romana seems further away than ever. In our perplexity and distress the Prince of Peace is our only refuge. Our Lady, Queen of Peace, will be our advocate. St. Thomas will add his powerful intercession, and More's "darling Erasmus" too, who, we may surely hope, has long since crept into heaven under the mantle of his martyred friend.

PHILIP E. HALLETT.

---

## SERMON NOTES

### THE HOLY EUCHARIST

THE essential virtues of holiness are the three theological virtues of faith, hope and charity, especially charity, which is "the bond of perfection". But there is another virtue too which is supremely important, as a groundwork of goodness. This is humility. "God resisteth the proud, but to the humble he giveth grace" (I Pet. v, 5). In the following notes we consider the Holy Eucharist in relation to these four virtues.

#### I

#### THE HOLY EUCHARIST AND HUMILITY

In the Holy Eucharist Our Lord comes before us as the great Exemplar of humility. Of the Incarnation St. Paul could say: "He emptied himself,

... taking the form of a servant. . . . He humbled himself . . . becoming obedient unto death, even the death of the cross" (Phil. ii, 7, 8). Here in the Blessed Sacrament there is a further emptying. On the cross His divinity was concealed, but here even His manhood is hidden. And since the sacrifice of the Mass is the renewal of the sacrifice of Calvary, the humiliation of Calvary is perpetuated in the Mass. We offer the Mass in memory of Him bruised and broken on the cross.

Further, in the act of faith which we are called upon to make in the Real Presence, our pride of mind is humbled. We must bow before a mystery, though the senses report nothing and we cannot understand how transubstantiation is effected.

Again, we offer the Mass as sinners (cf. Heb. v, 1-3). As the re-offering of the sacrifice of Calvary, the Mass is a propitiation for sins; and throughout the rite it strikes the note of our unworthiness because of our sins. "Lord, I am not worthy" is the key-sentiment of the Mass. The priest begins, not at the altar itself, but at the foot of the steps, praying to be cleansed before he dare approach. He asks God to set him apart from sinners and make him innocent. He acknowledges his sins before the whole court of Heaven and all the people. He ascends to the altar, and his prayer still is that God will cleanse his sins and those of the people. In the "Kyrie eleison" he appeals again for mercy. Before he dares to read the Holy Gospel he begs God to cleanse his heart and lips. At the Offertory, when he dedicates to God the bread to be consecrated, he dedicates it as "indignus famulus". He begs God to accept the immaculate Victim on behalf of his own sins, offences and negligences, countless in number, and those of all present and of all the faithful. As he offers the chalice, he prays similarly that it may be to the salvation of everyone. Then, bowing before the altar, he begs that "in a spirit of humility and in a contrite heart we may be received by Thee, O Lord". When he proceeds to incense the cross and the altar his prayer is that the incense may ascend to God and God's mercy descend; that his prayer may be directed as incense in the sight of God and the raising of his hands be an evening sacrifice. He asks God to put a guard on his mouth and a gate upon his lips, that his heart may not turn aside to evil words, to make excuses in sins. When he washes his hands he says the sixth psalm; "I will wash my hands among the innocent."

The Canon of the Mass is governed by the great words of institution and consecration which lie at its centre; it is a dramatic expansion of their significance and purpose, an extended appeal to God that He whose Blood is shed "in remissionem peccatorum" may thereby be our salvation and the fulfilment of our needs, that through Him we, although unworthy, may be an acceptable sacrifice. As the priest nears the end of the great prayer which enshrines the Consecration, his audible "nobis quoque peccatoribus" conveys man's attitude of soul before the great mystery of faith and mercy.

With the "Pater noster" the direct preparation for Holy Communion begins. Constantly here the priest stresses the note of unworthiness and begs for pardon. So we have "Forgive us our trespasses, etc.," and the expansion of these petitions in the "Libera nos", the "Agnus Dei", the emphasis on sin in the three following prayers, and the "Domine, non sum dignus".

After Communion it is the same. "May Thy Body, O Lord, which I have taken, and Thy Blood which I have drunk cleave to me inwardly, and grant, that the guilt of sins may not remain in me whom the pure and holy sacraments have restored." And finally, in the prayer before the blessing, the priest bows before the Sacred Trinity and prays that the sacrifice which he who is unworthy has offered may be acceptable to God and by His mercy may obtain propitiation for the priest himself and for those for whom he has offered it.

The Holy Eucharist is for us men. It is given us to offer and to receive. We must not stand aloof from it in awe of the majesty and sanctity of Christ. But all the time we must remember our unworthiness. He who would be in tune with the Church's sentiments as she handles the great Mystery must cultivate in his heart a profound humility.

## II

### THE HOLY EUCHARIST AND FAITH

To accept the dogma of the Holy Eucharist is a great act of faith. It is to accept absolutely Christ's word that the priest has power to transubstantiate the bread and wine into Our Lord's Body and Blood. Our senses record nothing new; they do not report any change. The wondrous act is completely hidden. Here indeed is the blessing of Christ earned: "Blessed are they who have not seen and have believed."

But it is much more than an act of faith in the Real Presence by Transubstantiation. It is an all-comprehensive act of faith in the entire system of Catholic truth. It is an act of faith in the Person of Christ and His twofold Nature, Divine and Human; and in the Divine Trinity of Persons of whom He is One. Without the Trinity there would be no Incarnation, as we know it; and without the Incarnation no Holy Eucharist—not in the sense that the Incarnation is caused by the Blessed Trinity and the Holy Eucharist by the Incarnation as though the relation were merely one of causality, as is the link between God and the created universe, but in the sense that the living Person of God the Son is common to each dogma, and the Incarnation is but the mission, and the Blessed Sacrament the prolongation of the mission of Him who has proceeded from the Father before all ages. "In the beginning was the Word . . . and the Word was God . . . and the Word was made flesh"; "the bread of God . . . which cometh down from heaven and giveth life to the world" (John i & vi).

To believe in the Holy Eucharist is thus to believe in all that the Person of Christ involves. It is to believe also in the entire work of Christ. It is an act of faith in the Redemption; for the Blessed Sacrament is one with the great atoning act of Calvary; the words of institution and consecration indicate it: "This is my body which is given for you", "This is the chalice, the new testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you" (Luke xxii, 19, 20). But Redemption involves the Fall and original sin; and, as applied to us, it is justification from all sin, both original and actual, it is the life of grace and

of the virtues. Hence in these great truths also we express our faith when we utter our *Credo* in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament. But yet again, in the act of faith in the life of grace, a whole range of mysteries is disclosed. The union of men in grace is that other Body of Christ, of which the Holy Eucharist is both symbol and agent; it is the living oneness of Christians in Christ, which is known as the Mystical Body. But the Mystical Body is both the Catholic Church and the Communion of Saints. Hence faith in the Mass is, on the one hand, faith in the unchanging Kingdom, the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, with its ruling College of Bishops, headed by the Pope, the Rock of the Church, the Visible Head and Vicar of the invisible Head and Shepherd of our souls; and on the other it is faith in the reality of Heaven, where reigns the Church Triumphant, and in the reality of Purgatory, where the members of the Church Suffering undergo their complete cleansing from the effects of sin, and in the reality of Hell, to which those go who have no part in the Communion of Saints, because the Mass has, through their own fault, been ineffective as a propitiation for their sins.

As expressing faith in the life of grace, our faith in the Holy Eucharist naturally expresses our faith in the means of grace, the Sacraments. The Eucharist is itself the chief of the Sacraments; and the Sacrament of Order is required for its production. Faith in Our Lady too is there, for she is the Mother of Him who is principal Priest, Victim and Altar of the Mass, and the spiritual Mother and Mediatrix of the Church, by which and for which the Mass is offered.

Thus the Holy Eucharist, as the object of our faith, gathers to itself the whole Catholic system. If now we consider the virtue of faith itself as it resides in us, we find that the Holy Eucharist has a special function in strengthening that virtue. It must necessarily have this function, since the sacramental grace of the Holy Eucharist is charity, and there can be no love without knowledge, and the more intense is the love, the more penetrating must be the knowledge. But apart from this general consideration, there is a special reason why the Holy Eucharist should deepen and intensify our faith. The special reason is that in the Blessed Sacrament we receive Him who is the Word of God, whose mission is to give light as well as life; "in him was life, and the life was the light of men" (John i, 4). In John vi "the bread of life" has two senses. In the later part of the discourse, from verse 48, it is exclusively the Holy Eucharist. But in the earlier part of the discourse it is at least equally the bread of doctrine, engendering faith (cf. Wiseman's Lectures on the Holy Eucharist). By the Blessed Sacrament, then, we are taught of God; our minds are drawn, held and enlightened by the truth. He who is the way and the truth and the life has his prayer fulfilled: "Sanctify them in truth. Thy word is truth" (John xvii, 17). (The relation of faith and truth to life and holiness is stressed right through Our Lord's prayer in John xvii.)

### III

#### THE HOLY EUCHARIST AND HOPE

"Hope," says the Catechism, "is a supernatural gift of God, by which we firmly trust that God will give us eternal life and all the means necessary

to obtain it, if we do what He requires of us." The basis of hope is God's infinite power, infinite goodness, and faithfulness to His promises.

The Holy Eucharist is the great means of stimulating and increasing our hope. For consider:

(1) Hope is an unwavering trust that God will give us eternal life. Now the Blessed Sacrament is "*futurae gloriae pignus*", according to the beautiful antiphon of St. Thomas. It is indeed Our Lord's own teaching:

"If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever. . . .

He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath everlasting life  
and I will raise him up in the last day. . . .

He that eateth this bread shall live for ever."

(John vi, 52, 55, 59.)

That this wonderful effect will be wrought by the Holy Eucharist depends of course on our dispositions and our persevering goodwill; but, for God's part, the Eucharist brings undying life and the guarantee of glory both for soul and risen body.

(2) As hope is a trust that God will give eternal life, so it is a trust that He will give the means thereto. He who promises the end must promise the means. Otherwise the end would be unattainable. Here again the Holy Eucharist is the great means of salvation. It is Christ Himself; and "there is no other name under heaven given to men, whereby we must be saved" (Acts iv, 12). That the Blessed Sacrament is the great means of salvation is obvious from John vi, where we are taught that to eat Christ's flesh is to abide in Christ, to be engrafted, therefore, on Him, the vine, apart from which we are worthless before God.

All the grounds of hope are manifest in the Holy Eucharist!

(1) God's infinite power. That power is exercised *on our behalf* in the wonderful and unique conversion of the whole substance of the bread into Christ's Body and of the whole substance of the wine into Christ's Blood.

(2) God's infinite goodness. Consider the statement of St. John: "Before the festival day of the pasch, Jesus knowing that his hour was come, that he should pass out of this world to the Father: having loved his own who were in the world, he loved them unto the end" (John xiii, 1). It was at the moment of the institution of the Holy Eucharist that Christ revealed Himself as loving His own to the end. Saints have interpreted this as meaning "to the extreme limit of love". It is indeed a proof of His utter goodness that He should exercise His almighty power to devise a means of spreading His presence everywhere and to the end of time.

(3) God's faithfulness to His promises. Christ's name is "faithful" (see Apoc. xix, 11 and 13). Moreover the Holy Eucharist is a gift for all time. It is the New Testament in His Blood, the "everlasting testament" (Heb. xiii, 20). He who is its author is the Eternal Priest: "a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedech" (Ps. cix, 4 and Heb. v, 6 and vii, 17). Rightly then we sing at Benediction: "His mercy is confirmed upon us: and the truth of the Lord abideth for ever."

Whatever, then, is a ground of hope and a stimulus of hope is found in



the Blessed Sacrament. We cannot but have confidence in God when we realize the significance of the Holy Eucharist. "Hope in God, for I will give praise to him: the salvation of my countenance and my God" (Ps. xlii, 6).

Finally we may recall that hope is the desire of a good not yet possessed. That desire in us is wonderfully aroused by the Holy Eucharist:

Jesu, quem velatum nunc aspicio,  
Oro fiat illud quod tam sitio,  
Ut Te revelata cernens facie  
Visu sim beatus Tuæ gloriæ.

## IV

## THE HOLY EUCHARIST AND CHARITY

Christ's mission was to give life, that new life of grace which is superadded to the natural life by which we are human beings. "I am come that they may have life and may have it more abundantly" (John x, 10). Right through St. John's Gospel "life" is given as the purpose of Christ's coming. It is the life of love or charity.

This life of love is pre-eminently the fruit of the Holy Eucharist. Our Lord puts forward the effect of the sacrament as an intimacy of friendship when he says: "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me: and I in him" (John vi, 57). So close an abiding together involves a union of mind, will and affection, which is precisely friendship.

Then again, when at the institution He says: "Take ye and eat, this is my body", He puts Himself under the forms of food whose very nature is to become one with the recipient, and thus shows His purpose of coming into the closest possible union with the souls of men, that His mind may be in them, His thoughts their thoughts, His affections and desires theirs; briefly, that between Him and them there may be "idem velle, idem nolle", which is the height of friendship.

In this union of friendship Christ's influence is paramount. He transforms us into the likeness of Himself. Ordinary food is changed into the recipient. This heavenly Food is different. It changes us. It permeates us with the life which Christ came to give, according to His word: "As the living Father hath sent me and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, the same also shall live by me" (John vi, 58). "God," writes St. John, "is charity: and he that abideth in charity abideth in God, and God in him" (I John iv, 16). There are many definitions of God; but St. John would choose just this one: "God is charity." The subsistent Charity became incarnate: "In this we have known the charity of God, because he hath laid down his life for us" (I John iii, 16). Loving us, and delivering Himself for us, He also delivered Himself to us, that we might renew daily His act of sacrificial love and might draw on charity at its source, and thus live by that which is characteristic of God, namely love. (Compare I John iv, 16 and John vi, 57.)

This transforming union of each of us with Christ at once links us together. The one charity pervades us all. So there comes about through the Holy Eucharist universal brotherhood in God, and Christ's prayer is fulfilled: "That they all may be one, as thou, Father, in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us" (John xvii, 21); "I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one" (ibid., 23). St. Paul saw a symbol of that loving unity in the very texture of the bread which we consecrate. He writes: "For we, being many, are one bread, one body: all that partake of one bread" (I Cor. x, 17).

J. CARTMELL.

---

## NOTES ON RECENT WORK

### HOLY SCRIPTURE

IT is a pleasing coincidence that two works on the Parables, both by Catholic authors who are also Dominican Fathers, have arrived within the last few days. One of them has had to make the long, hazardous crossing of the Atlantic; the other has come from no more distant point than the other side of the Irish Sea. Neither is precisely new in the sense preconized by the London Library, of having been first published during the past twelve months, but, with some inversion of what might be expected, the more recent of the two is the one that has had the longer voyage.

The first is *The Parables of Christ with Notes for Preaching and Meditation* by Fr. Charles J. Callan, O.P., Professor of Holy Scripture at Maryknoll, and author or part-author of many other works, including that excellent one to the recitation of the Breviary entitled *The Psalms Explained*, and a whole series of lucid, dependable commentaries on the Gospels and the Epistles of St. Paul. The present book may well be reckoned to be the most useful of the author's writings, more particularly when it is considered from the point of view of the Sunday homilies on the Gospel. It has a short introduction dealing with our Lord's use of parables, the chief rules for their interpretation, the doctrine of the Kingdom of Heaven contained therein, and the number and order of the parables (these last, as is pointed out, being problematic on which authors hold widely divergent views). Each of the parables is then discussed under five headings, the treatment having as its starting-point the New Testament text in Fr. Francis Spencer's translation from the Greek. There follow some notes on the context and setting, an account of the imagery or illustration used by our Lord, "the application and teaching illustrated by some development of details, and, finally, a section on the lessons of the parable. It must be said that the treatment is often somewhat brief, and that one misses the ample discussions of grammar and exegesis to be found in such works as those of Vosté, Fonck, and others. This remark applies especially to the first four sections, whereas the fifth section, dealing with

lessons, is usually worked out at some length and should be of considerable help to preachers. It corresponds to those *conclusiones doctrinales* which were, at one time at least, so important a part of any exegetical paper in certain Roman examinations in Holy Scripture. Perhaps the chief defect in this excellent volume is the lack of any detailed survey of the history of interpretation, so often a valuable guide to the sense of a particular passage. On the other hand, Fr. Callan gives a full list of the principal authors consulted, many of whom pay much attention to the *historia exegeseos*, and he is in the excellent company of Lightfoot, Boylan, and many other experts who refuse to catalogue the vagaries of interpretative criticism.<sup>1</sup>

The second work to be mentioned is *The Parables of Our Lord*,<sup>2</sup> by the late Père Marie-Joseph Ollivier, O.P., a study which in the original French edition has been before the public since 1909. The English translation by E. Leahy was first issued in 1927, and this second edition in a new and more attractive format should be welcome. Unlike Fr. Callan, who, on the principle of *non multo sed multa*, finds no less than fifty-six parables to interpret, Père Ollivier confines himself to eighteen and comments at some length upon many of these. His treatment of his subject is, in general, far more developed than Fr. Callan's, and he has been at pains to accumulate a wealth of detail regarding the Palestinian background to the parables, the customs of the people of the land, and the mentality of the various groups that listened to our Lord's teaching. There is, in fact, almost a superabundance of local colour, and sometimes, as in the delightful chapter on the Prodigal Son, a single phrase of the narrative is made the text for many pages of rather prolix dissertation.<sup>3</sup> There is, however, a great deal that is really valuable and attractive in Père Ollivier's book, and one may agree with the translator that: "His learning, imagination, and powers of illustration throw light on every page", (p. vii), with the proviso that the light is occasionally an *ignis fatuus*. The footnotes contain many misprints and hybrid forms; of the latter "Cornel. Jans. de Gand" is a curious example.

From time to time most students of the Bible are asked to recommend a

<sup>1</sup> So Lightfoot writes on Gal. iii, 20: "The number of interpretations of this passage is said to mount up to 250 or 300. Many of these arise out of an error as to the mediator, many more disregard the context, and not a few are quite arbitrary. Without attempting to discuss others which are not open to any of these objections, I shall give that which appears to me the most probable." *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, in loc.

<sup>2</sup> Dublin, Browne & Nolan, 1943. Pp. xxii + 359. Price 10s. 6d.

<sup>3</sup> Thus the words of the Vulgate *profectus est in regionem longinquam* may be said to set the author scouring the ancient world for a country that might be considered to be "far off, strange, and a land of luxury and voluptuousness" (p. 142). He argues that, since the prodigal showed no interest in politics, and had no ambition to be a king, he would not have selected Rome as the scene of his adventures. Some pages of further discussion lead to the conclusion that Egypt alone would have provided all the conditions required by the text, with the result that the prodigal's return is, as it were, protracted by sundry objections on the difficulties of a journey from the Delta to the Holy Land for one who would not afford to pay his passage to Joppa! Since there is not the slightest proof that this parable is taken directly from life, all this theorizing seems excessive, more especially as the author has remarked at the very beginning of the parable: "One scarcely dares to touch this exquisite page, even to point out its beauties . . ." (p. 135), after which he proceeds to do both for thirty pages of print.

good book on the theology of St. John's writings, and it is not always easy to find a work that satisfies the enquirer and (a very important limiting clause at the present hour) that is easily obtainable. Among Catholic works, none of them, to be sure, very new, there is the long chapter entitled "Jean le théologien" in the introduction to Père Lagrange's commentary; there is M. L. Venard's admirable article in the eighth volume of the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, and there are various sections of Père Lemonnier's little manual on *The Theology of the New Testament*, which in its translated form is a volume in Sands' "Catholic Library of Religious Knowledge". Among Anglican writers of conservative tendency may be mentioned the late Dr. J. H. Bernard, who in the introduction to his volumes on St. John's Gospel in the "International Critical Commentary" has discussed many points of Johannine theology, such as the Logos doctrine, the Kingdom of God and the new birth, and the Eucharist in the Fourth Gospel. Excellent as all these works are, they are not, in any case, less than fourteen years old, and the body of recent work on the Johannine writings is indeed considerable. It has now been clearly summarized and assessed by Dr. W. F. Howard, the learned editor of J. H. Moulton's *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, in a volume in Duckworth's Theological Series bearing the title *Christianity According to St. John*.<sup>1</sup>

This is not Dr. Howard's first work on St. John. In 1931 he published *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation* which, in addition to his own contribution, provided an analysis of almost every book of any importance produced in Europe or America in the course of the previous thirty years. A second edition of this most readable introduction appeared in 1935, and a third edition is promised for after the war. On the question of authorship Dr. Howard adopted what would be regarded in some quarters as a distinctly conservative solution—that the writer, though not the Apostle, was the disciple of St. John the Beloved Disciple and Apostle of Christ. The present work is mostly concerned with doctrine, and very little with authorship. There is, it is true, an illuminating first chapter on "Johannine Christianity" in which a quantity of points are rather summarily determined. So, for example, Dr. Howard has decided, in estimating St. John's contribution to theology, to leave out the Apocalypse from his survey, since for him it is almost impossible to think of it as coming from the author of the other four writings traditionally ascribed to St. John. Yet with complete fairness he allows that commentators who are both eminent and radical have called attention to "common features so striking as to suggest a common origin", so that the late Dr. R. H. Charles went so far as to say: "The Evangelist was apparently at one time a disciple of the Seer, or they were members of the same religious circle at Ephesus" (pp. 13-14). A Catholic, more particularly one who had studied Père Allo's convincing statement of the evidence in his *L'Apocalypse de St. Jean*, would go a good deal further, but testimony wrung from a radical critic sometimes proves to be a valuable solvent of the critic's own case. In this same chapter there are some wise remarks about the general characteristics of St. John's Gospel and on certain methods of emphasis (called here explicative, mandatory, and

<sup>1</sup> London, Duckworth, 1943. Pp. 221. Price 6s. net.

proleptic) for which readers must be referred to the book. Dr. Howard finds that in this Gospel "the Jewish character of both language and thought stand out" clearly, in spite of all efforts to relate Johannine ideas to the mystery religions, to Mandaeen gnosticism, and to the Hermetic writings, and that, by way of contrast with St. Paul who remained to the end "a Jew in all the deepest workings of his mind", St. John could never forget that his people had rejected the Messias.

It is impossible to do more than mention the remaining chapters on the Logos of Life; Father, Son and Holy Spirit; Man, Sin, and Salvation; Eschatology and Mysticism; Church, Ministry and Sacraments; Faith, Knowledge, and Love; and (as a fitting climax) the Way, the Truth, and the Life. These last words are well glossed in the sentence quoted from Dr. F. J. A. Hort which claims that: "The whole seeming maze of history in nature and man . . . has running through it one supreme dominating Way; and that He who on earth was called Jesus the Nazarene *is* that Way" (p. 194).

The symposium edited by A. J. Arberry and Rom Landau, and entitled *Islam To-Day*,<sup>1</sup> seems to invite comparison with the delightful volume in the "Legacy" series which deals with *The Legacy of Islam*.<sup>2</sup> But, whereas the earlier work, published in 1931, dealt largely with an Islamic culture which was viewed, like some Pharaoh in the Cairo museum, as a mummy embalmed in a remote past, the present volume deals with an Islam that is extremely alive and active, as may be seen, in some measure, by any student of the map "showing distribution of Islam throughout the world". Probably it is not always fully realized, even by those who have made some study of Mohammedanism, that Islam is not merely an influence, but is a predominating influence throughout the greater part of Africa and vast areas of Asia. No general estimate appears to be given here of the total number of Moslems in the world, and it is well known that experts are much divided with regard to this total. So the famous Dr. Zwemer, for many years editor of the *Moslem World*, was of the opinion that the number of genuine Moslems could be reduced to about 120 millions, and that of these comparatively few were true monotheists. Whatever the real numbers may be, *Islam To-Day* goes far to endorse the justice of Marshal Lyautey's comparison of the Islamic world to a resonant box, since the faintest sound in any one corner of the box reverberates throughout the whole of it. Of the sixteen articles on the Arab and non-Arab countries that contain the vast majority of Moslems, the most interesting in itself, and for readers of the Bible, is that on "Palestine and Transjordan" by General Sir Arthur Wauchope, who writes with the inside knowledge of one who was High Commissioner and Commander-in-Chief in these regions from 1931 to 1938. The sections on Arab and Jewish life in Palestine, and on the relations between the two races at the present day, are of deep interest, though neither here nor in the other papers is there anything so instructive as the late Mr. Austin Kennett's book on *Bedouin Justice*. The chapter on Egypt by Dr. Taha Hussein is far too short to be of any great service. The Syrian scholar who writes under

<sup>1</sup> London, Faber & Faber, 1943. Pp. 258. Price 12s. 6d.

<sup>2</sup> See CLERGY REVIEW, vol. III, p. 153.

the pseudonym of Meleager on "Islam in Syria" gives the best account of Islamic literary culture, and urges the need for a library of European classics in an Arabic translation, and for editions of the basic works of Islamic thought both for scholars and for the educated reading public. The illustrations are not numerous, but they have been carefully selected. Perhaps the best is that entitled "Senussi at prayer" (facing p. 108).

JOHN M. T. BARTON.

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

### FUNERAL OF UNBAPTIZED INFANTS

Is the practice of reciting some prayers at the funeral of an unbaptized child of Catholic parents to be approved? (Sacerdos.)

#### REPLY

Canon 1239, §1: *Ad sepulturam ecclesiasticam non sunt admittendi qui sine baptismo decesserint.*

Canon 1212: *Praeter cimiterium benedictum alius, si haberi queat, sit locus, clausus item et custoditus, ubi ii humentur quibus sepultura ecclesiastica non conceditur.*

(i.) The question was discussed in this REVIEW, 1940, XVIII, p. 544, particularly with reference to cases where the child has died with the mother at childbirth; if the child is buried together with the mother, as is the common practice, the rite for adults is used, and though technically against the law, there is good authority for tolerating the interment of both in consecrated ground, unless some local regulation forbids it.

(ii.) For other cases we gave the opinion that "any suitable prayers may be said for the consolation of the relatives, but it is forbidden to employ the burial form for infants given in the ritual"; it is equally forbidden to inter the body in consecrated ground.

We cannot find any writer in support of this view that some prayers of a general character may be said at the graveside. It is an act of charity which one is anxious, if possible, to perform, if it can be justified without sacrificing any principle or violating any grave law. The law is not violated, for what is forbidden is "*sepultura ecclesiastica*" as defined in Canon 1204: "*. . . consistit in cadaveris translatione ad ecclesiam, exequiis super illud in eadem celebratis, illius depositione in loco legitime deputato fidelibus defunctis condendis*". For baptized infants the Church has provided a special and very striking rite, which certainly cannot be used even in part, since the prayers and the whole sentiment are inapplicable to the unbaptized.

But there is no law against saying prayers for the comfort of the living in any place, including the ground set apart for the burial of the unbaptized. The prayers could be the *Pater Noster*, a decade of the Rosary, or a choice of psalms expressing resignation to the will of God, e.g. Ps. xxxii. Such prayers may be said unless the priest's presence is forbidden by local law.

(iii.) Is there any principle at stake? There certainly is if the impression is created that the infant is being buried with ecclesiastical rites, as though it were a member of the Church. This would cause scandal, encourage disbelief in the necessity of baptism, and apparently sanction the negligence of parents in failing to have their children baptized without delay. An analogy may be perceived with the prohibition of Mass after a Mixed Marriage; the Code Commission, 10 November, 1925, supporting the law of canon 1102, §2, forbade even a private Mass "*si haec Missa ex rerum adiunctis haberi possit uti complementum caeremoniae matrimonialis*".

Therefore, if prayers are said by the priest on these occasions at the graveside, the possibility of scandal must be removed, which can usually be done by a few words addressed to those present.

#### THEATRE LAW

Could one's Ordinary properly, and with some chance of success, be requested to dispense from the observance of the theatre law in an individual case? (X.)

#### REPLY

Canon 82: *Episcopi alique locorum Ordinarii dispensare valent in legibus dioecesanis, et in legibus Concilii provincialis ac plenarii ad normam can. 291, §2, non vero in legibus quas speciatim tulerit Romanus Pontifex pro illo peculiari territorio, nisi ad normam can. 81.*

Canon 291, §2: *Decreta Concilii plenarii et provincialis promulgata obligant in suo cuiusque territorio universo, nec Ordinarii locorum ab iisdem dispensare possunt, nisi in casibus particularibus et iusta de causa.*

A discussion about the origin and force of the law in *Conc. Prov. Westm.* IV, Dec. xi, 9, may be seen in this REVIEW, 1932, III, pp. 89 and 220; 1938, xiv, p. 265. It is within the competence of each Ordinary to interpret the law in individual cases, but not to give an authentic interpretation *ad modum legis*, as explained by Van Hove, *De Legibus*, p. 253 n. 4. For the power to give an interpretation in an individual case is necessarily contained within that of dispensing in an individual case. Provided, therefore, one has a just cause, a petition for an interpretation or for a dispensation may properly be addressed to the competent Ordinary.



## RESERVATION IN PERICULO MORTIS

In a reply given, 1941, XXI, p. 49, the first para. states that there is a subsequent obligation of recourse to the competent superior in the case of censures reserved "ab homine". From n. 13 of the Faculties printed, 1940, XVIII, p. 304, this would appear to be incorrect, since recourse is there limited to censures reserved *specialissimo modo*. (C. F.)

## REPLY

Canon 2245, §2: *Censura ab homine est reservata ei qui censuram tulit.* . . .

Canon 2252: *Qui in periculo mortis constituti . . . receperunt absolutionem ab aliqua censura ab homine vel a censura specialissimo modo Sedi Apostolicae reservata, tenentur, postquam convaluerint, obligatione recurrendi, sub poena reincidentiae.* . . .

*S.C. Consist.* 8 December, 1939, n. 13: (facultas) absolventi ab omnibus casibus et censuris quomodocumque reservatis . . . cum onere tamen . . . sub poena reincidentiae recurrendi, si de censuris specialissimo modo Sedi Apostolicae reservatis . . . agatur.

n. 14: *Imminenti aut commisso proelio: (a) meminerint sacerdotes se, licet ad confessiones non adprobatos, facultate gaudere omnes milites . . . absolvendi . . . a quibusvis peccatis et censuris, iniunctis de iure iniungendis.*

*Quoniam vero . . . ipsae civitates . . . aëreis incursionibus expositae inveniuntur . . . liceat sacerdotibus eisdem (Christifideles) a quibusvis peccatis et censuris reservatis et notoriis, etiam formula generali absolvere.* . . .

(i.) The answer is, we think, correct, since it is applicable to any priest whatever, and takes no account of those, such as Army Chaplains, who may have received faculties which are even wider than those given by the common law in canon 2252. As we pointed out at the time, commenting on these faculties (1940, XVIII, pp. 308 and 311), n. 14 is no more than a reminder, with liberal interpretations, of the powers all priests possess by the common law in canons 882, 892, §2 & 2252. The powers of n. 13, on the other hand, are enjoyed only by those who have received them from the military authorities. When a chaplain, who possesses the faculty of n. 13, absolves in the circumstances of n. 14, his absolution from "ab homine" censures is wider than that given by a civilian priest who is relying on the common law alone; no recourse is necessary since n. 13, a faculty restricted to Army Chaplains, makes no mention of this obligation except for censures reserved *specialissimo modo*. Cf. *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, March 1940, p. 309.

(ii.) The Sacred Penitentiary, 18 April, 1936, defined the practice of the Holy See regarding those priests who incurred the censure of canon 2388, which is reserved "speciali" not "*specialissimo modo*". According to the directions of other documents and faculties issued since that date, recourse is always necessary whenever this censure is absolved and the penitent desires to receive the sacraments habitually as a lay person. Hence, also, in

the faculties issued 8 December, 1939, recourse is declared to be necessary. It means, in effect, that this particular censure is, in given circumstances, reserved "specialissimo modo". Cf. CLERGY REVIEW 1936, XII, p. 158 and 1937, XIII, p. 271.

(iii.) It must be remembered, finally, that all these faculties, whether in n. 13 or n. 14, are for the internal forum of the Sacrament of Penance. Thus, a person absolved from a censure reserved *ab homine* by a priest enjoying the faculty of n. 13 is under no obligation of recourse in the sacramental forum. But in the external forum the superior's rights remain intact and can be enforced according to the terms of canon 2251, an important definition of the relations between the internal and external forum.

### MASS SERVER AND CHALICE VEIL

Should the server, after the ablutions, remove the chalice veil from the epistle to the gospel side of the altar? (Sacerdos.)

### REPLY

The exact movements of a server at Low Mass are not defined in every detail by the rubrics. They have developed in principle from the actions performed by the ministers at a solemn Mass, saving those which are proper to clerics in sacred orders, and those which have been expressly forbidden by the Congregation of Rites. It will be found, accordingly, that writers have different views on the correctness of moving the chalice veil. Those in favour would justify it, no doubt, on analogy with what is done at a solemn Mass: Ambrose, *How to Serve Mass*, p. 5; Page, *A Practical Guide for Servers*, p. 32. Those not in favour would very likely argue from D.A. 3448, 14, which forbids the server, for the convenience of the priest, to turn the pages of the Missal in order to find the Communion text: Fortescue, *Ceremonies of the Roman Rite*, 1st ed. p. 81; Calnan, *Correct Mass-Serving*, p. 37.

Apart from the two writers mentioned we have not found the practice defended by classical commentators, and Fr. O'Connell, who must be considered in the first rank of such, is definitely against it; cf. *The Celebration of Mass*, Vol. II, p. 208. Our own view is that it should not be done. But, since there exists no express prohibition, it may be permitted when Mass is celebrated at a very small altar in order that sufficient space may be left for the Missal.

### FIRST FRIDAY VOTIVE MASS

Under what conditions may one have a votive Mass of the Sacred Heart on the first Friday of the month? (Z.)

## REPLY

S.R.C. 28 June, 1889; D.A. 3712: In iis vero Ecclesiis et Oratoriis, ubi Feria VI, quae prima unoquoque in mense occurrit, peculiaria exercitia pietatis in honorem divini Cordis, approbante loci Ordinario, mane peraguntur: Beatissimus Pater indulgit, ut hisce exercitiis addi valeat Missa votiva de Sacro Corde Iesu; dummodo in illam diem non incidat aliquod festum Domini, aut duplex primae classis, vel Feria, Vigilia, Octava ex privilegiatis; de cetero servatis rubricis.

This votive Mass, like other popular devotions introduced during the pontificate of Leo XIII, is *sui generis*, though resembling in many respects the solemn votive Mass "pro re gravi et simul publica causa" which is regulated in *Addit. et Var. in Rubr. Miss.* II, 3.

(i.) Since the decree makes no distinction, the Mass—which may be even a Low Mass—may be celebrated in any church or oratory, public, semi-public or private, but only one votive Mass is allowed, unless the rubrics happen on that day to permit votive Masses in general, in which case the additional votive Masses must follow the ordinary rules of such. The Mass is *Cogitationes* as found in all Missals since 1929 on the Friday following the Octave of Corpus Christi; the *Gloria* and *Credo* are said, and of course the proper preface.

(ii.) The idea underlying this privilege is that the votive Mass is part of the devotions which are taking place in the morning in honour of the Sacred Heart. In this respect it somewhat resembles the Leonine October devotions, concerning which the decrees sometimes refer to Mass being celebrated during the recitation of the Rosary. It is, therefore, a *sine qua non* that special devotions to the Sacred Heart shall take place either immediately before or immediately after the Mass. The exact nature and extent of these devotions are not defined, but the point offers no particular difficulty since the Ordinary's previous approbation is required: usually the Litany and some Acts of Reparation would be considered the minimum; the approbation is given in some dioceses for all churches and chapels, in others at the request of individuals.

(iii.) It will be found, generally speaking, that it is the exception for this votive Mass to be forbidden by the rubrics. Like all matters of this kind, it is governed by a mass of detailed rules which make the subject almost a rubricist's Mecca. Many diocesan calendars indicate when any modifications occur owing to the exceptions formulated in the above decree, or one could obtain the universal calendar and adapt it to the local one. Failing this, it will be necessary to consult some modern expert writer on the subject, such as O'Connell, *Celebration of Mass*, Vol. I. pp. 101-105, or Crogaert, *De Rubricis Missalis Romani* pp. 148-152. The rules are too detailed to be summarized accurately in the space permitted us, but any special *dubia* which occur may be submitted for solution.

## BENEFICES RESERVED TO THE HOLY SEE

Parish "X" becomes vacant through the death of the parish priest, a domestic prelate. The parish priest of "Y" is commended for "X" and the

parish  
the Ho

Car  
confer  
Car  
confer

1.  
Familia  
benefic

4-  
manus  
verit, t

All  
1435, S  
is equa  
"X" is  
"Y", t

automa  
If i  
certain  
observ  
previo  
month  
was of  
notice  
presen  
vacanc  
du Cler

On  
that th  
other r

S.F.  
Jacobi  
sacerd  
loco a  
datur  
tur; q  
descrip

parish priest of "Z" for "Y". Are all three benefices thereby reserved to the Holy See?

REPLY

Canon 1431: Ius Romano Pontifici est beneficia in universa Ecclesia conferendi eorumque collationem sibimet reservandi.

Canon 1434: Beneficia Sedi Apostolicae reservata ab inferioribus invalide conferuntur.

Canon 1435, §1: . . . sunt reservata Sedi Apostolicae. . . .

1. Omnia beneficia, etiam curata, quae vacaverint per obitum. . . . Familiarium, etiam honoris tantum, Summi Pontificis tempore vacationis beneficium.

4. Denique beneficia quibus Romanus Pontifex per se vel per delegatum manus apposuit his qui sequuntur modis: . . . si beneficiarium promoverit, transtulerit. . . .

All three are reserved to the Holy See: "X" obviously from canon 1435, §1, 1. The reservation of "Y" and "Z" is less obvious, perhaps, but is equally certain from canon 1435, §1, 4. From the fact that the vacancy in "X" is being filled by the promotion or translation of the parish priest of "Y", the Supreme Pontiff has thereby "laid his hands" upon "Y" which automatically becomes reserved. Similarly with "Z".

If it is thought that this process is, perhaps, a little exorbitant, since certain fees are payable to the Holy See on these occasions, it may be observed, firstly, that papal reservations in post-Code law are less than they previously were; formerly all vacancies occurring in nine out of the twelve months of the year used to be reserved to the Holy See, though the number was often reduced by arrangement or concordat. Secondly, it should be noticed that this multiplication of reserved benefices can be avoided by presenting an unbeneficed cleric, a seminary professor for example, for the vacancy in "X". Cf. Commentators on canon 1435, and especially *l'Ami du Clergé*, 1933, p. 25.

PRESERVATION OF DECEASED PERSON'S HEART

One hears occasionally of directions in a person's will to the effect that the heart of the deceased shall be deposited in some place or institution other than the place of burial. Is this permitted? (S.)

REPLY

S.R.C., 11 February, 1898, n. 3982: Quum in Archidioecesi Sancti Jacobi de Cile aliquando contingat ut, mortuis Episcopis aliisque praeclaris sacerdotibus, cor eorum extrahatur et honorifice servetur in domo vel pio loco ab ipsis fundatis vel praedilectis; atque conservatio ita fiat ut claudatur cor in ampulla vitrea, in visibili loco et inter flores ordinarie collocatur; quaeritur: potestne haec praxis continuari? . . . Affirmative; dummodo descripta conservatio cordis non fiat in loco sacro.

A recent example of this practice is the case of Cardinal Bourne, buried at St. Edmund's College, whose heart is deposited at St. John's Seminary, Wonersh. Cf. *Tablet*, 11 May, 1935, p. 603. In the past it was very common. Brady, *Annals of the Catholic Hierarchy*, p. 161, gives the inscription placed over the heart of Bishop Bonaventure Giffard, which was buried in the chapel of Douay College in the choir near the sanctuary. The words "non fiat in loco sacro" refer to publicly exposing the heart in a sacred place, a prohibition which has in mind the possibility of the object being popularly treated as the relic of a saint.

E. J. M.

---

## ROMAN DOCUMENT

### ENTHRONEMENT OF THE SACRED HEART IN THE HOME

This formula is not found in the Roman Ritual. We reprint it, for the convenience of readers, from the English supplement of the Tournai (1935) edition of the Ritual. It is printed also in *The Pocket Ritual* (Burns Oates, 1930). The Act of Consecration is essential for gaining the indulgences attached to this devout practice. Cf. *A.A.S.*, x, 1918, p. 155.

*At the appointed hour, the whole family should meet before the Image of the Sacred Heart, which should be placed on an Altar decorated with flowers and lights.*

*The priest then blesses the Image, as follows:*

- ℣. Adiutorium nostrum in nomine Domini.
- ℟. Qui fecit cælum et terram.
- ℣. Dominus vobiscum.
- ℟. Et cum spiritu tuo.

### OREMUS.

OMNIPOTENS sempiternæ Deus, qui Sanctorum tuorum imagines pingi non reprobas, ut quoties illas oculis corporis, intuemur, toties, eorum actus, et sanctitatem ad imitandum memoriæ oculis meditemur, hanc, quæsumus, Imaginem in hororem et memoriam Sacratissimi Cordis Unigeniti Filii tui Domini Nostri Jesu Christi adaptatam, bene ✠ dicere et sancti ✠ ficare digneris; et præsta ut quicumque coram illa Cor Sacratissimi Unigeniti Filii tui suppliciter colere et honorare studuerit, illius meritis et obtentu, a te gratiam in præsentem, et æternam gloriam obtineat in futurum. Per Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.

*He then sprinkles it with holy water.*

*All here recite the Creed as an expression of the faith of the whole family.*

*The priest will here opportunely remind those assembled that Our Lord has a particular regard for such families as are especially consecrated to Him, and he will also indicate the special and superabundant blessings stored up for such homes.*

*The priest will then read:*

### THE ACT OF CONSECRATION

*Recited by the priest and by the members of the family.*

Most Sacred Heart of Jesus, Thou hast revealed to Saint Margaret Mary Thy desire to reign over Christian Families. Behold us, therefore, assembled here today to proclaim Thine absolute Kingship over ours. We desire henceforth to shape our lives in accordance with Thine, to cultivate at our hearth those virtues to which Thou hast promised peace here below and to ward off from it that worldly spirit which Thou hast condemned.

Thine it will be to reign over our minds by the simplicity of our faith and over our hearts by a boundless love for Thee alone, with which they shall burn, a love we intend to keep alive by the frequent reception of the Holy Eucharist. Vouchsafe, O Divine Heart, to preside at our meetings, to bless our spiritual and temporal concerns, to banish our cares, to sanctify our joys and to lighten our sorrows. If one or other of us should at any time have the misfortune to offend Thee, remind him, O Divine Heart, that for the repentant sinner Thou hast naught but kindness and mercy. And when the hour of parting comes and death shall bring bereavement to our home, then shall we all, both those that are called away and those that are left, be resigned to Thine eternal decrees. One thought shall then uphold us, that a day will come when our family, reunited in heaven, shall extol for ever Thy glories and Thy benefits. May the Immaculate Heart of Mary and the glorious Patriarch, Saint Joseph, vouchsafe to present to Thee this our consecration, and to keep us mindful of it day by day. Hail, Sacred Heart of Jesus, our King and Father!

As no one ought to be absent from the home on so solemn an occasion, let us at this holy hour recall the memory of our departed and absent relatives, reciting for them a *Pater* and an *Ave*.

Then the head of the family installs the picture of the Sacred Heart in the place of honour chosen for it, and this being done, all present may recite any other suitable prayers; the rite may conclude with the priest's blessing "*Benedictio Dei Omnipotentis etc.*"

---

---

BOOK REVIEWS

*The Common Life in the Body of Christ.* By L. S. Thornton. Pp. xiii + 470. (Dacre Press. 30s.)

THE first impression conveyed by Mr. Thornton's book is that of the untiring industry, the careful study, the scrupulous desire to be objective, and the intense reverence for the Sacred Scriptures, which have gone to the making of it. This is a study in biblical theology, and it has been the author's object to explore in the New Testament the meaning of that inner life by reason of which all Christians are one in the Body of Christ. Mr. Thornton has approached his subject with full awareness of the difficulties which beset the exponent of biblical theology. Chief among them is the lack, in the New Testament, of that logical and systematic order of thought which is no less indispensable to theology than to other sciences; neither the

Gospels nor the Epistles, composed as they were to meet the pastoral requirements of the early Christian communities, can be expected to provide us with a theology ready made. Hardly less important is the difficulty which arises from the forms of thought and language in which the divine revelation is clothed by the New Testament writers; these, excellently adapted though they are to expressing the thought of the inspired authors, do not lend themselves easily to that scientific formulation which every theology, biblical as well as systematic, must require. That Mr. Thornton has not succeeded entirely in overcoming these difficulties is apparent in the fact that his book makes very hard reading indeed. This is in great part due to his anxiety to avoid definitions and theses; one has the feeling of being overwhelmed with a flood of familiar Scriptural texts, but without deriving from them any clear and distinct theological ideas.

From time to time, however, it is possible to gather what Mr. Thornton understands by "grace", a notion which is indispensable to any constructive doctrine of the Mystical Body. At one moment it appeared to the reviewer that the writer's conception of sanctifying grace might approximate to the Catholic definition; especially in those pages (82 ff.) where he deprecates what he calls "looking-glass theology", i.e. the practice of translating objective truths into their subjective counterpart. He criticizes on this ground certain tendentious versions of Rom. v, 5, a passage which is rendered in the Douay-Rheims translation, "The charity of God is poured forth in our hearts by the Holy Ghost who is given to us." Thus he rightly condemns Sanday and Headlam's paraphrase: "That Holy Spirit which we received when we became Christians floods our hearts with the consciousness of the love of God for us", because this emphasis upon our consciousness detracts from the objective "'givenness' of God's love as it descends upon us and enters our hearts" (p. 83). Nevertheless it is a disappointment to find that his own description of the transformation brought about by grace does not greatly differ from the subjective conceptions which he repudiates: "The statement of Romans v, 5 refers to a transformation of our spiritual condition through an illumination of the mind" (103). The effect of the giving of the Spirit is described as that of illuminating the mind "with the full truth of God's love in Christ" (p. 104), a love which is beyond ordinary human understanding. When, moreover, we find the sacraments described as "moral instruments which challenge us to respond to God's love" (p. 428) we realize that we are as remote as ever from the Catholic idea of grace as a real and abiding supernatural quality which transforms the soul, not merely by giving it a new appreciation of God's love, but by making it truly a partaker of the divine nature and radically capable of the vision of God. And without such a conception of grace no doctrine of the Mystical Body can commend itself to the Catholic theologian.

G. D. S.

*King James the Last.* By Jane Lane. Demy 8vo. Pp. xii + 336. (Andrew Dakers, Ltd.)

In a virile Jacobite Preface to this book Mr. Compton Mackenzie declares that he does not believe that the historian exists who is capable of securing



the kind of revaluation of James II which has been secured in our own time for his elder brother Charles II. Yet the author of *King James the Last* comes very near to achieving success in this difficult task. The very title of her book proclaims its theme, the struggles of the later Stuarts against the political ambition and financial power of the Whig Oligarchy, the overthrow of Monarchy in this country with the evils attendant on that overthrow which readers of Belloc will know so well. Basing herself mainly on Lingard, Belloc and James's own Memoirs, Miss Lane tells her story in five Parts—The Cause, The Champion, The Opposition, The Battle, and The Aftermath. She tells it with colour, with sparkle even, in a way which will undoubtedly offend the more staid professional historians, but with an enthusiasm which is captivating. There are weaknesses, of course, notably in the account of the Titus Oates affair, where the problem of the murder of Mr. Justice Godfrey is ignored, and in which, despite general accusations, nothing very definite is pinned on Shaftesbury. A sound up-to-date biography of this last is still one of the greatest needs for this period.

Miss Lane is at her best in dealing with the King himself, his work as Duke of York, his courage, his love for the Navy, his tolerance, and, most important of all, his deeply rooted patriotism, his love and admiration for the ordinary people of England, the soldiers and the sailors of his day. Her picture of his old age at St. Germain, and the scene at his deathbed, with Louis XIV's acceptance of his claim for the Prince of Wales are finely done. Altogether a good piece of Stuart writing.

A. B.

*The Epistle to Diognetus.* By E. H. Blakeney. Pp. 94. (S.P.C.K. 6s.)

At a price which in wartime must be admitted to be moderate we have here an excellently produced edition of one of the most mysterious among early-Christian documents. Concerning the Epistle to Diognetus hardly anything can be established with certainty. We know neither the name of its author nor the place or time of its composition; nor do we even know who Diognetus was. Internal evidence seems to place the work at a period intermediate between the Apostolic and Apologetic age; the writer having in common with the Apostolic Fathers a habit of adhering strictly to the language of the New Testament in his exposition of Christian doctrine (his statement of the dogma of Redemption is rigidly Pauline), and yet sharing with St. Justin and other apologists of the second century a predilection for the Greek philosophy. It is therefore commonly attributed to the latter half of the second century. Mr. Blakeney's introductory notes and commentary, which together occupy some seventy of the ninety-four pages which compose the book, will be found useful and instructive; though perhaps the Catholic reader will derive greater benefit from the wealth of parallel illustrations provided than from the editor's theological discussions. The Greek text is given without translation.

G. D. S.

*Mother of Jesus.* By G. D. Carlton. Pp. 98. (The Pax House. 4s. 6d.)

IN a series of eighteen chapters, which appear to have been designed as short instructions, Mr. Carlton sets forth some of the more important truths concerning Our Lady which are taught by the Catholic Church, and apart from some "kenotic" statements on page 41 they contain little that the Catholic theologian would not accept. But perhaps the author is less convincing when he maintains that his views on Our Lady can be easily reconciled with the official teaching of the Church of England.

G. D. S.

*Studies in Life.* By Stephen J. Brown, S.J. Pp. 243. (Browne and Nolan Ltd. 8s. 6d.)

IN this pleasant book of essays Fr. Brown rambles over a variety of topics which concern every man and woman. He treats of the spirit of childhood; the changed outlook on life which comes with the years; the need to make allowances for one another; the influence of the crowd; the message of the poets; the quest of true interior peace; guides to happiness; teachers of life; the relations of a man with his past, present, and future; and the true meaning of life. Taken all together, the essays give a practical philosophy of life, a sane and wise outlook on its problems, and considerable help in ordering one's own life prudently. Naturally it is the Catholic attitude to life which the author gently and persuasively teaches. The book contains much to set one thinking, but Fr. Brown writes so attractively that one likes to think along with him. Then, too, he introduces so many beautiful quotations from the poets that anyone with a taste for literature will not easily lay down the book, but will recur to it again and again, and will learn truth through beauty, almost, it may be, in spite of himself.

J. CARTMELL.

*My Leader in Life.* By George Burns, S.J. (Burns Oates. 2s. 6d.)

THIS is a very good, practical little book for our Youth. It includes a great deal in a small compass: prayers, doctrinal and moral instruction, spiritual guidance. A glance through its contents will show the kind of book it is. It is in two parts. In Part I (Foundations) we have The Blessed Trinity, The Words of the Leader (Our Lord), The Work of the Leader, Seven Sacraments, The Mother of God, Sundays and Mass. In Part II (Applications) Tips, Tests and Temptations, Making Decisions, Leadership, Questions You May Be Asked, Ten-point Programme, Bits of Prayers. We recommend the book wholeheartedly. No one who buys it will regret his choice; and he will be a better youth and a better man by carefully perusing it.

J. CARTMELL.

#### PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

d.)  
ed as  
ortant  
a, and  
e than  
least  
easily

T  
N

S.

W

which  
does  
Chur  
answe  
no.  
most  
So  
being  
toget  
Swor  
which  
this r  
to se  
critic  
think  
ave  
ism  
Catho  
of th

L.

udes a  
ction,  
and b  
nd of  
strug  
lessed  
the b  
eader,  
art II  
enge  
ve h  
insid  
regret  
refully

L.

more  
aint  
solel  
have  
nine  
purit  
V